DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 858 HE 029 785

AUTHOR	Kirshstein, Rita J.; And Others
TITLE	Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education. 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93). Statistical Analysis Report.
INSTITUTION	Pelavin Research Inst., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	NCES-97-080
PUB DATE	Nov 96
NOTE	111p.; For related document, see ED 375 792.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Mail Stop: SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-9328.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; Employment Level; *Full Time Faculty; Higher Education; *Part Time Faculty; Tables (Data); *Teacher Employment; *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty

ABSTRACT

This is the second publication released from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), a study about faculty and instructional staff in U.S. higher education institutions. The document presents findings from the institution survey of NSOPF-93 regarding their policies and practices toward faculty and staff, including: full-time, part-time permanent, temporary, instructional faculty and staff, and non-instructional faculty. Data reported include: (1) number and distribution of full- and part-time faculty and staff; (2) movement of full-time faculty and staff from their institutions; (3) distribution of tenure systems and tenured faculty; and (4) benefits provided to different groups of faculty and instructional staff. The survey found that, among other things, U.S. institutions of higher education employed approximately 1 million faculty and instructional staff in the fall of 1992, and 90 percent had instruction as their major regular assignment. There was about a 1 percent increase in the number of permanent full time instructional faculty and staff between fall 1991 and fall 1992, despite the fact that 6 percent of permanent full time instructional faculty and staff left their institutions because of retirement, downsizing, or other reasons. The Survey Questionnaire is appended. (MAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Statistical Analysis Report **November 1996**

1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty
(NSOPF-93)

Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education

Rita J. Kirshstein
Nancy Matheson
Zhongren Jing
Pelavin Research Institute

Linda J. Zimbler
Project Officer
National Center for Education Statistics

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement **NCES 97-080**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Statistical Analysis Report November 1996

1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)

Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education

Rita J. Kirshstein
Nancy Matheson
Zhongren Jing
Pelavin Research Institute

Linda J. Zimbler
Project Officer
National Center for Education Statistics

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement NCES 97-080

U.S. Department of Education
Richard W. Riley
Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Sharon P. Robinson
Assistant Secretary

National Center for Education Statistics
Pascal D. Forgione, Jr.
Commissioner

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to:

National Center for Education Statistics
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20208–5574

November 1996

Contact:

Project Officer
Linda J. Zimbler
(202) 219–1834

The NCES World Wide Web Home Page is
http://www.ed.gov/NCES/

Suggested Citation

U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93), Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education,* NCES 97-080, by Rita J. Kirshstein, Nancy Matheson, and Zhongren Jing. Project Officer, Linda J. Zimbler. Washington, DC: 1996.

FOREWORD

This publication is the second publication released from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93), a study about faculty and instructional staff in higher education institutions in the country. The NSOPF-93 and its predecessor, NSOPF-88, were conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) within the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education to fill the information gap about this important population in our society. Additional support for the NSOPF has been provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation.

The first publication, *Faculty and Instructional Staff: Who Are They and What Do They Do?*, presented data from the faculty survey of NSOPF-93. This publication presents findings from the institution survey of NSOPF-93. Institution representatives were asked to respond to questions regarding their institutions' policies and practices toward their faculty and instructional staff. We hope the information in this report will be of interest to the research community and will stimulate discussions on faculty issues. Based on the number of individuals who have contacted the National Center for Education Statistics since the release of the first NSOPF-93 publication, we know there is a keen interest in data on faculty and instructional staff in our nation's colleges and universities. We hope that NSOPF-93 and future cycles of NSOPF will provide useful information to these individuals.

While this is the only publication that NCES plans to release from the NSOPF-93 institution survey, we do plan to release several more reports from the NSOPF-93 faculty survey. We encourage individuals to keep track of our publications through the internet at http://www.ed.gov/NCES and through our announcements to the higher education community.

Finally, researchers are strongly encouraged to conduct their own in-depth analysis of the NSOPF data.

Paul D. Planchon
Associate Commissioner
Surveys and Cooperative Systems Group

Daniel Kasprzyk
Director
Education Surveys Program

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to the many people who made valuable contributions to this report. In particular, we acknowledge the guidance provided by Linda Zimbler and Roslyn Korb of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

We would like to thank Sal Corrallo, Marilyn McMillen, and Mary Rollefson of NCES for their review and comments on the report. We also wish to thank Ernst Benjamin, American Association of University Professors; William P. Fenstemacher, New England Board of Higher Education; Jeff Thomas, National Endowment for the Humanities; and Valerie Conley, Synectics for Management Decisions, Inc., for their review of the report. Additional technical review of the report was provided by Michael Cohen of NCES. Statistical support was provided by Stephen Wenck of Pinkerton. Editorial and publication help was provided by Robert LeGrand, Publications Division, Media and Information Services, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

We are very appreciative of the significant contribution provided by Sameer Abraham, who served as Project Director at NORC, Natalie Suter, who served as Associate Project Director; Kirk Wolter, Senior Vice President, Statistics and Methodology; and by other NORC staff including Lance Selfa, Marek Pietrzyk, Jay Goddard, and Shaun Koch. Lance Selfa, Natalie Suter, and Kirk Wolter co-authored the Technical Notes.

Also, we wish to thank the members of the NSOPF-93 National Technical Review Panel, whose knowledge of and various perspectives on the issues contributed importantly to both the richness of the study and its relevance to the higher education community. Finally, our gratitude is extended to the thousands of individuals who participated in the study, including institutional coordinators, administrators, and faculty members. Clearly, the study could not have been completed without their cooperation.

6

HIGHLIGHTS

This report presents findings from the survey of institutions of higher education[1] conducted as a part of the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93). The survey gathered data from institution representatives on policies and practices that relate to their institutions' faculty and instructional staff. The NSOPF-93 institution survey collected data on a wide range of faculty and instructional staff, including those who, in the fall of 1992, were:

- Full-time;
- Part-time;
- Permanent;
- Temporary;
- Instructional faculty and staff; and
- Non-instructional faculty.

In this report, the term "faculty" includes individuals both with and without instructional responsibilities. Additionally, some institutions do not confer faculty status on all individuals with instructional duties. Individuals who are not designated as faculty but who teach courses are referred to as instructional staff.

Each section of this report focuses on a slightly different group of faculty and instructional staff. Section 2 presents the number and distribution of full- and part-time instructional faculty and staff, and full- and part-time non-instructional faculty, in different types of higher education institutions. Full- and part-time refer to the employment status of an individual as defined by the college or university itself, not to how much time that person spent on a particular activity such as teaching. Section 3 examines faculty movement of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff and non-instructional faculty from their specific institutions of higher education. Section 4 focuses on the distribution of tenure systems and tenured faculty in different types of higher education institutions, as well as tenure policies for permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff and permanent full-time non-instructional faculty. Section 5 examines benefits provided to 5 different groups of faculty and instructional staff: permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff, permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, temporary full-time non-instructional faculty, and part-time instructional faculty and staff. Finally, Section 6 provides a summary of key findings.

The remainder of this section highlights key findings from each section of the report; it does not provide an exhaustive overview of the findings of this report. To provide clarity, references to specific groups of faculty and instructional staff appear in bold in the findings below.

---

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

Size and Composition of Faculty and Instructional Staff

- In the fall of 1992, according to reports from institutional respondents, institutions of higher education in the United States employed approximately 1 million **faculty and instructional staff** (table 2.1).

- Although public colleges and universities (including research, doctoral, comprehensive, and 2-year) accounted for 79 percent of all higher education enrollments and 69 percent of all **faculty and instructional staff**, they comprised only 48 percent of all higher education institutions in 1992 (table 2.1).

- About 90 percent of all **faculty and instructional staff** employed by institutions of higher education had instructional duties as their major regular assignment during the fall of 1992 (table 2.3).

- About 35 percent of **non-instructional faculty** (faculty whose major regular assignment is research, administration, or community service, for instance) were employed in public research institutions (table 2.3).

Faculty Movement

- There was about a 1 percent increase in the number of **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** employed by all institutions of higher education in the United States between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 (table 3.1).

- There was about a 3 percent increase in the number of **permanent full-time non-instructional faculty** from the fall of 1991 to the fall of 1992 (table 3.1).

- About 6 percent of all **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** employed by institutions of higher education in 1991 left the institution at which they were employed between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992. Of those who left during that time, 37 percent retired, 4 percent left because of downsizing, and 59 percent left for other reasons[2] (table 3.2).

- Seventy-seven percent of public research institutions and 66 percent of public doctoral institutions offered early or phased retirement to **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** between 1987 and 1992, compared with 40 percent of all higher education institutions. Approximately 23,300 permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff employed during these years took advantage of the offer of early or phased retirement (table 3.3).

---

[2] The NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire did not provide the institutional respondent with the opportunity to specify what was meant by "other" reasons. However, obtaining a new job was likely to be a primary "other" reason for leaving the institution.

- Thirty percent of the nearly 2,000 higher education institutions with **permanent full-time non-instructional faculty** offered them early or phased retirement. About 2,300 permanent full-time non-instructional faculty took advantage of the offer to retire between 1987 and 1992 (table 3.3).

Tenure Systems

- Seventy-one percent of institutions with **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** had tenure systems in the fall of 1992, while only 47 percent of institutions with **permanent full-time non-instructional faculty** had tenure systems (table 4.1).

- Virtually all public research, private research, public doctoral, and public comprehensive institutions had tenure systems for **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff**. In contrast, 66 percent of public 2-year institutions had tenure systems for this group of faculty and instructional staff (table 4.1).

- While 58 percent of all **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** had tenure in 1992, only 23 percent of **permanent full-time non-instructional faculty** had tenure (table 4.1).

- In 1992, tenure was granted to 73 percent of **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** who were considered for tenure during the 1992-93 academic year and 89 percent of such **permanent full-time non-instructional faculty** (table 4.2).

- Eighty-three percent of the higher education institutions with tenure systems placed a limit on the maximum amount of time that **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** could remain in a tenure track position (table 4.3).

- Between the fall of 1987 and the fall of 1992, about one-half of higher education institutions took some actions to lower the percentage of tenured full-time instructional faculty and staff: 23 percent of all institutions employing **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** raised tenure standards for this group of faculty and staff; 18 percent replaced some tenured or tenure-track permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff positions with fixed-term contract positions; and 8 percent of the institutions took other actions designed to lower the percentage of tenured full-time instructional faculty and staff (table 4.4).

Faculty Benefits

- An overwhelming majority of institutions of higher education offered some sort of retirement plan to both **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** (97 percent) and **permanent full-time non-instructional faculty** (95 percent) in 1992 (tables 5.1 and 5.2). In contrast, only 43 percent of higher education institutions that employed **part-time instructional faculty and staff** offered some type of a retirement plan to them (table 5.3).

- The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association/College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA/CREF) was the most commonly offered retirement benefit to **permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff** and **permanent full-time non-instructional faculty** (tables 5.1 and 5.2).

- Almost all higher education institutions offered medical insurance or medical care to **permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff** (99 percent) (tables 5.4 and 5.6). In contrast, only 45 percent of the institutions employing **temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff** and 39 percent of the institutions employing **temporary full-time non-instructional faculty** offered medical insurance or care to these groups (tables 5.5 and 5.7).

Table of Contents

Page

FOREWORD iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

HIGHLIGHTS v

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION 2: FACULTY AND THEIR INSTITUTIONS 5
- Distribution of Faculty and Instructional Staff and Higher Education Institutions 5
- Number and Distribution of Faculty and Instructional Staff 6

SECTION 3: FACULTY MOVEMENT 11
- Number of Permanent Full-time Faculty and Instructional Staff and Percentage Change between Fall 1991 and Fall 1992 11
- Faculty and Instructional Staff Departures and Reasons for Departure from Higher Education Institutions 11
- Institutions Offering Early or Phased Retirement Options and Faculty and Instructional Staff Accepting These Options 12

SECTION 4: THE TENURE SYSTEM 17
- Tenure Systems and Faculty Tenure 17
- Number of Permanent Full-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff Considered for and Granted Tenure 18
- Institutions That Limit Time on Tenure Track and the Maximum Number of Years Allowable on Tenure Track 18
- Institutions That Have Taken Specified Actions Related to Tenure 19

SECTION 5: FACULTY BENEFITS 25
- Retirement Plans 25
- Other Employee Benefits 26
- Eligibility Criteria for Part-time Instructional Faculty and Staff 27

SECTION 6: SUMMARY 37

Appendices

Appendix A: Technical Notes 39
- Overview 40
- Institution Universe 40
- Faculty Universe 40

Page

Sample Design 41
First Stage Sampling 42
Second Stage Sampling 43
Data Collection and Response Rates 43
Best Estimates of Faculty 45
Weight Calculations 47
Imputation of Missing Data 48
Sources of Error 48
Calculating Estimates for Institutions Selected with Certainty 50
Replicate Weights 51
A Note About Estimates Based Upon Small Samples 51
Standard Error Tables 52

Appendix B: The Survey Questionnaire 73

Tables

2.1 Percentage distribution of higher education institutions and faculty and instructional staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 7

2.2 Number and percentage distribution of full- and part-time higher education faculty and instructional staff, by instructional status (i.e., instructional or non-instructional), by permanent or temporary status: Fall 1992 8

2.3 Percentage distribution of higher education faculty and instructional staff by employment status and type and control of institution: Fall 1992 9

3.1 Percentage change between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 in the number of permanent full-time higher education faculty and instructional staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 14

3.2 Percentage of permanent full-time higher education faculty and instructional staff who left institutions of higher education between 1991 and 1992, by reason for leaving and type and control of institution: Fall 1992 15

3.3 Percentage of higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992 and percentage distribution of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff accepting early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 16

4.1 Percentage of institutions with tenure systems for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and percentage with tenure, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 21

Page

4.2 Percentage of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff considered for tenure and of those considered, the percentage who were granted tenure during the 1992-93 academic year, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 22

4.3 Percentage of institutions that limit time on tenure track for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and percentage distribution of the maximum number of years on a tenure track without tenure, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 23

4.4 Percentage of higher education institutions that took specific actions related to tenure during the past five years, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 24

5.1 Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 28

5.2 Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 29

5.3 Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 . 30

5.4 Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 31

5.5 Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 32

5.6 Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 33

5.7 Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any temporary full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 34

5.8 Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 35

5.9 Percentage of higher education institutions with criteria for benefit eligibility for part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 36

Page

Appendix A (Technical Notes) Tables

T2.1 Standard errors of percentage distribution of higher education institutions and faculty and instructional staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 53

T2.2 Standard errors of percentage distribution of full- and part-time higher education faculty and instructional staff, by instructional status (i.e., instructional or non-instructional), by permanent or temporary status: Fall 1992 54

T2.3 Standard errors of the percentage distribution of higher education faculty and instructional staff by employment status and type and control of institution: Fall 1992 55

T3.1 Standard errors of net percentage change between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 in the number of permanent full-time higher education faculty and instructional staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 56

T3.2 Standard errors of the percentage of permanent full-time higher education faculty and instructional staff who left institutions of higher education between 1991 and 1992, by reason for leaving and type and control of institution: Fall 1992 57

T3.3 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992 and the percentage distribution of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff accepting early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 58

T4.1 Standard errors of the percentage of institutions with tenure systems for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and percentage with tenure, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 59

T4.2 Standard errors of the percentage of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff considered for tenure and of those considered, the percentage who were granted tenure during the 1992-93 academic year, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 60

T4.3 Standard errors of the percentage of institutions that limit time on tenure track for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and percentage distribution of the maximum number of years on a tenure track without tenure, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 61

T4.4 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions that took specific actions related to tenure during the past five years, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 62

Page

T5.1 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 63

T5.2 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 64

T5.3 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 65

T5.4 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 66

T5.5 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 67

T5.6 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 68

T5.7 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any temporary full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 69

T5.8 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 70

T5.9 Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions with criteria for benefit eligibility for part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992 71

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

The diversity of American higher education is reflected in the number and variety of colleges and universities in this country as well as in the faculty and instructional staff employed by these institutions. As both tuition and the costs of providing a college education continue to rise, attention is increasingly drawn to the role and work of faculty and instructional staff in higher education institutions, since they represent a significant component of institutional expenses. Comprehensive data about them, however, have been relatively scarce.

In 1992-93, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), with additional support from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), conducted a comprehensive study of higher education faculty and instructional staff. The 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) gathered data from a nationally representative sample of higher education institutions regarding their faculty policies and practices. Faculty and instructional staff were surveyed separately regarding a number of factors related to their work, backgrounds, and attitudes.[3]

This report presents findings from the NSOPF-93 survey of institutions. Drawn from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), the institutional universe for this survey included 3,256 postsecondary institutions that met all of the following criteria:

- The U.S. Department of Education recognized its accreditation as a collegiate institution;
- The institution provided formal instructional programs of at least 2-years' duration; and
- The college or university was public or private nonprofit.[4]

The institution sample consisted of 962 eligible colleges and universities. Of these, 872 (90.6 percent) completed an institution questionnaire.[5]

---

[3] The first cycle of NSOPF, conducted in 1987-88, included three components: institutions, department chairpersons, and individual faculty members. The 1992-93 effort, while it did not include a survey of department chairpersons, expanded the samples of institutions and faculty considerably. See the *Technical Notes* for details of these changes.

[4] While the IPEDS universe includes for-profit institutions, the institutional universe for NSOPF-93 only included nonprofit higher education institutions.

[5] See the *Technical Notes* for a more detailed discussion of sampling procedures, survey administration, response rates, and imputation procedures.

The chief administrative officer (CAO) of each institution was asked to designate an institutional coordinator who often served as the main respondent to the institution questionnaire. The institutional coordinator was typically an academic officer, provost, dean, institutional researcher, or budget officer. The number of institution staff required to complete the self-administered institution questionnaire varied from a low of 1 to a high of 5, with an average of slightly less than 2 respondents (1.78) per institution.

The NSOPF-93 institution survey gathered data on policies and practices affecting both instructional faculty and staff and non-instructional faculty. Furthermore, full-time faculty and instructional staff were distinguished from part-time faculty and instructional staff, and permanent appointments were considered separately from temporary ones. Institutions were given a glossary that provided guidelines for determining which faculty should be included in the instructional faculty/staff and the non-instructional faculty categories. The following instructions were provided:

- **Instructional faculty/staff** — All institutional staff (faculty and non-faculty) whose major regular assignment at this institution (more than 50 percent) is instruction. This corresponds to the IPEDS definition. Individuals do not need to have a dedicated instructional assignment to be included in this category. Be sure to include (1) administrators whose major responsibility is instruction; (2) individuals with major instructional assignments who have temporary, adjunct, acting, or visiting status; (3) individuals whose major regular assignment is instruction but who have been granted release time for other institutional activities; and (4) individuals whose major regular assignment is instruction but who are on sabbatical from your institution.

  Please do not include: Graduate or undergraduate teaching assistants, postdoctoral appointees, temporary replacements for personnel on sabbatical leave, instructional personnel on leave without pay or teaching outside the U.S., military personnel who teach only ROTC courses, and instructional personnel supplied by independent contractors.

- **Non-instructional faculty** — All institutional staff who have faculty status but would not be included as instructional faculty since their specific and major regular assignment is not instruction but may be for the purpose of conducting research, performing public service, or carrying out administrative functions of the institution.

Respondents also were asked to provide their institution's definitions of six different groups of faculty or instructional staff: full-time instructional faculty/staff; full-time non-instructional faculty; part-time instructional faculty/staff; part-time non-instructional faculty; permanent faculty/instructional staff; and temporary faculty/instructional staff. These definitions varied considerably and were based on a wide range of criteria, from hours worked per week to number of courses taught. Common definitions of temporary faculty and instructional staff included affiliated or adjunct faculty and faculty who had an acting appointment. Common definitions of permanent faculty and instructional staff included clinical and research faculty.

This report examines the distribution of faculty and instructional staff as reported by the institutional respondents in different types of colleges and universities as well as institutional policies and practices that affect them. For the purposes of this study, a modified Carnegie classification was used to distinguish among the various types of institutions of higher education in the country.[6] The following institutional categories were used in this report:

- **Public research:** Publicly controlled institutions among the 100 leading universities in Federal research funds. Each of these universities awards substantial numbers of doctorates across many fields.

- **Private research:** Privately controlled not-for-profit institutions among the 100 leading universities in Federal research funds. Each of these universities awards substantial numbers of doctorates across many fields.

- **Public doctoral:** Publicly controlled institutions that offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and Ph.D. degrees in at least three disciplines, but tend to be less focused on research and receive fewer Federal research dollars than the research universities. In this report, this group also includes publicly controlled institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

- **Private doctoral:** Privately controlled not-for-profit institutions that offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and Ph.D. degrees in at least three disciplines, but tend to be less focused on research and receive fewer Federal research dollars than the research universities. In this report, this group also includes privately controlled institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

- **Public comprehensive:** Publicly controlled institutions that offer liberal arts and professional programs; a master's degree is the highest degree offered.

- **Private comprehensive:** Privately controlled not-for-profit institutions that offer liberal arts and professional programs; a master's degree is the highest degree offered.

- **Private liberal arts:** Privately controlled not-for-profit institutions that are smaller and generally more selective than comprehensive colleges and universities; primarily offer bachelor's degrees, although some offer master's degrees.

- **Public 2-year:** Publicly controlled institutions that offer certificate or degree programs through the Associate of Arts level and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate programs.

---

[6] See the *Technical Notes* for a discussion of the institution classification and *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.* (Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), 1987.

- **Other:** Public liberal arts, private 2-year,[7] and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

Section 2 presents estimates of full- and part-time faculty and instructional staff in different types of higher education institutions as reported by institutional respondents.[8] Section 3 examines the movement of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff from higher education institutions for reasons of retirement, downsizing, or other situations. Section 4 describes characteristics of tenure systems for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and non-instructional faculty in different colleges and universities. Section 5 examines benefits provided to full-time instructional faculty and staff, full-time non-instructional faculty, and part-time instructional faculty and staff. The final section presents a summary of key findings.

All comparisons that are noted in the report are statistically significant at the .05 level.[9]

---

[7] Public liberal arts and private 2-year institutions have been placed in the other category, because there are relatively few of them in the country.

[8] See the *Technical Notes* for a discussion of the NSOPF-93 sample design, the survey methodology, the weight calculations, and the accuracy of the estimates.

[9] See the *Technical Notes* for a discussion of sources of error.

SECTION 2

FACULTY AND THEIR INSTITUTIONS

This section highlights the distribution of faculty and instructional staff employed by institutions of higher education in the fall of 1992. Unless otherwise specified, faculty include individuals both with and without[10] instructional responsibilities. In addition, some institutions do not confer faculty status on all individuals with instructional duties. Those individuals who are not designated as faculty but who teach courses or supervise academic activities are referred to in this report as instructional staff. Faculty and instructional staff include individuals employed full and part time, as well as those with temporary and permanent appointments.

Distribution of Faculty and Instructional Staff and Higher Education Institutions

In the fall of 1992, according to reports from institutional respondents, institutions of higher education in the United States employed approximately 1 million faculty and instructional staff[11] (table 2.1).

Although public colleges and universities (including research, doctoral, comprehensive, and 2-year) accounted for 79 percent of all higher education enrollments[12] and 69 percent of all faculty and instructional staff, they comprised only 48 percent of all higher education institutions in 1992 (table 2.1). Of the 3,188[13] institutions of higher education in 1992, 32 percent were public 2-year colleges. Other institutions, a group that includes public liberal arts colleges, private 2-year colleges, and religious and other specialized institutions (except medical), comprised 22 percent of all higher education institutions, but employed only 8 percent of all faculty and instructional staff (table 2.1).

---

[10] Examples of faculty without instructional responsibilities include: faculty whose major regular assignment was research, administration, or community service.

[11] This estimate is derived from the NSOPF-93 institution survey. The institution survey asked institutional representatives for counts of the institution's faculty and instructional staff. Another estimate of the number of faculty and instructional staff was derived from lists of faculty and instructional staff provided by participating institutions. These lists were used to sample individual faculty and instructional staff and to have them respond to the NSOPF-93 faculty survey. Thus, the estimated number of faculty and instructional staff will depend on the NSOPF-93 component used to derive the estimate. See the *Technical Notes* for a discussion of the sample design, the survey methodology, the weight calculations, and the accuracy of the estimates.

[12] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Enrollment in Higher Education: Fall 1986 Through Fall 1994.* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1996.

[13] The first-stage NSOPF-93 sampling frame consisted of the 3,256 postsecondary institutions drawn from the 1991-92 IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) universe. A sample of 974 institutions drawn from this frame was found to include 12 ineligible institutions. The remaining 962 eligible institutions represented an estimated 3,188 higher education institutions in the country in 1992.

Table 2.2 presents the numbers and percentages of different groups of full- and part-time faculty and instructional staff. In 1992, 59 percent of all faculty and instructional staff were employed full time. Temporary full-time faculty comprised 8 percent of all full-time faculty and instructional staff ((29,070 + 19,417)/615,191) and 5 percent of all full-time instructional faculty and staff (29,070/539,210).

Number and Distribution of Faculty and Instructional Staff

Instructional Faculty and Staff

In the fall of 1992, about 90 percent of faculty and instructional staff employed by institutions of higher education had instructional duties as their major regular assignment (940,192/1,035,055) (table 2.3). Of these, 43 percent were employed part time (400,981/940,192).[14]

Among the institutional categories used in this report, public 2-year institutions employed the largest percentage of instructional faculty and staff (32.5 percent). However, public 2-year institutions employed only 21 percent of full-time instructional faculty and staff, and 48 percent of part-time instructional faculty and staff (table 2.3). Public 4-year institutions (including research, doctoral, and comprehensive) employed 45 percent of the full-time instructional faculty and staff, but only 23 percent of the part-time instructional faculty and staff.

Non-Instructional Faculty

About 9 percent of all faculty and instructional staff did not have instructional responsibilities as their major regular assignment in the fall of 1992 (94,864/1,035,055). The vast majority of the non-instructional faculty were employed full time (80 percent) (75,981/94,864) (table 2.3).

As was the case with instructional faculty and staff, the distribution of non-instructional faculty varied considerably by type and control of institution. About 35 percent of non-instructional faculty were employed in public research institutions; collectively, public 4-year institutions (including research, doctoral, and comprehensive) employed 57 percent of such faculty. Public 2-year institutions employed about 20 percent of the non-instructional faculty (table 2.3).

---

[14] Part-time replacements for faculty who were on sabbatical were included in the 1988 survey but not in the 1993 survey.

Table 2.1 — **Percentage distribution of higher education institutions and faculty and instructional staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Higher education institutions	Faculty and instructional staff
	Number	**Number**
	3,188	1,035,055
	Percent	**Percent**
All institutions[1]	100.0	100.0
Public research	2.2	14.7
Private research	1.0	5.4
Public doctoral[2]	3.0	8.3
Private doctoral[2]	2.6	5.0
Public comprehensive	10.7	14.6
Private comprehensive	8.2	7.2
Private liberal arts	18.0	5.9
Public 2-year	31.9	31.3
Other[3]	22.4	7.5

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals. Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T2.1 of the *Technical Notes.*

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 2.2 — **Number and percentage distribution of full- and part-time higher education faculty and instructional staff, by instructional status (i.e., instructional or non-instructional), by permanent or temporary status: Fall 1992**

	Faculty and instructional staff	
Status	**Number**	**Percent**
Total	1,035,055	100
Full-time	**615,191**	**59**
Instructional	539,210	52
Permanent	510,141	49
Temporary	29,070	3
Non-instructional	75,981	7
Permanent	56,564	5
Temporary	19,417	2
Part-time	**419,864**	**41**
Instructional	400,981	39
Non-instructional	18,883	2

NOTE: Because of rounding, details may not add to totals. Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T2.2 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 2.3 — Percentage distribution of higher education faculty and instructional staff by employment status and type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Faculty and instructional staff	Instructional faculty and staff			Non-instructional faculty		
		Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time
	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
	1,035,055	940,192	539,210	400,981	94,864	75,981	18,883
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
All institutions[1]	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Public research	14.7	12.7	17.6	6.1	34.6	33.9	37.4
Private research	5.4	5.5	6.8	3.7	4.7	4.7	4.8
Public doctoral[2]	8.3	8.2	10.1	5.5	9.5	9.9	8.0
Private doctoral[2]	5.0	5.2	5.7	4.6	2.6	2.9	1.3
Public comprehensive	14.6	14.8	17.5	11.1	12.9	12.8	13.4
Private comprehensive	7.2	7.4	6.2	8.9	5.9	6.3	4.4
Private liberal arts	5.9	6.1	7.1	4.8	3.9	4.3	2.0
Public 2-year	31.3	32.5	20.9	48.0	19.9	18.0	27.6
Other[3]	7.5	7.7	8.0	7.2	6.0	7.2	1.1

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals. Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T2.3 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

SECTION 3

FACULTY MOVEMENT

While the previous section described the distribution of all faculty and instructional staff employed by institutions of higher education, this section and the next focus almost exclusively on a subset of this group, namely, permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff. Approximately 55 percent of the faculty and instructional staff discussed in the previous section were permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff in 1992 (table 2.2). This section highlights changes from 1991 to 1992 as reported by an institutional respondent in the number of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff employed by institutions of higher education, and explores the nature of the movement (i.e., left due to retirement, downsizing, or reasons other than retirement or downsizing) of this group across these 2 years.

Number of Permanent Full-time Faculty and Instructional Staff and Percentage Change between Fall 1991 and Fall 1992

Permanent Full-time Instructional Faculty and Staff

Institutions of higher education in the United States reported an increase of about 1 percent in the number of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 (table 3.1).

There was some variation in the percentage change in permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 by type and control of institution. Among those showing increases in the percentages of full-time instructional faculty and staff between 1991 and 1992 were private research institutions (2.4 percent), private liberal arts colleges (1.5 percent), and public 2-year institutions (1.0 percent) (table 3.1).

Permanent Full-time Non-instructional Faculty

Institutions reported an overall increase of 3 percent in the number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 (table 3.1). Public research and private research institutions experienced a significant percentage increase in this type of faculty (3.5 percent and 5.1 percent) between 1991 and 1992.

Faculty and Instructional Staff Departures and Reasons for Departure from Higher Education Institutions

Permanent Full-time Instructional Faculty and Staff

Approximately 6 percent of all permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff employed by institutions of higher education in 1991 left the institution at which they were employed between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 (table 3.2). Of those who left during that time, 37 percent retired, 4 percent left because of downsizing, and 59 percent left for reasons other than retirement or downsizing (table 3.2).[15]

There was some variation in reasons for leaving by type and control of institution. Lower than average percentages of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff in private doctoral, public research, and private research institutions left due to retirement (22 percent, 31 percent, and 27 percent, respectively, compared to 37 percent overall). A higher than average proportion of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff in public 2-year institutions left due to retirement (50 percent of those who left). In all institutions, downsizing was rarely stated as a reason for the departure of this group of instructional faculty and staff. Of those who departed, the percentage who left due to downsizing ranged from less than 1 percent of the 6 percent who left a private research institution, to 7 percent of the 6 percent who left a public 2-year institution (table 3.2).

Permanent Full-time Non-instructional Faculty

The percentage of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who left the institution at which they were employed between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 (7.4 percent) was larger than the percentage of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff who left during the same period (6.4 percent) (table 3.2). Of those permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who departed during this time, 26 percent retired, 2 percent left as a result of downsizing, and 72 percent left for other reasons.

Generally, the type of college or university employing permanent full-time non-instructional faculty did not affect reasons for leaving. In all institutions, downsizing accounted for the departure of no more than an estimated 2 percent of the 7 percent of the permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who left a higher education institution between 1991 and 1992 (table 3.2).

Institutions Offering Early or Phased Retirement Options and Faculty and Instructional Staff Accepting These Options

Permanent Full-time Instructional Faculty and Staff

In the 5 years between 1987 and 1992, 40 percent of all higher education institutions offered early or phased retirement to permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff.[16] During that period, 23,256 permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff took advantage of the offer of early or phased retirement (table 3.3).

There was considerable variation in the percentage of institutions offering early or phased retirement and the number of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff accepting this offer by type and control of institution. Between two-thirds and three-fourths of public doctoral and public research institutions offered early or phased retirement to permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff between 1987 and 1992. In contrast, one-third of private liberal arts institutions and about one-half of public 2-year colleges offered these options (table 3.3). Of the 23,256 permanent full-time instructional faculty who accepted early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992, 32 percent came from public 2-year institutions (table 3.3).

---

[15] The NSOPF institution questionnaire did not provide the institutional respondent with the opportunity to specify what was meant by "other" reasons. However, obtaining a new job was likely to be a primary "other" reason for leaving the institution.

[16] Institutional respondents were asked about changes that had occurred at their institutions in the last 5 years.

Permanent Full-time Non-instructional Faculty

In the 5 years between 1987 and 1992, 30 percent of higher education institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty offered them early or phased retirement; 2,293 of them accepted the offer (table 3.3). The percentage of higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement varied by institutional type and control. A significantly lower than average percentage of private liberal arts institutions offered their permanent full-time non-instructional faculty the option of early or phased retirement (7.3 percent). In contrast, a significantly higher than average percentage of public institutions (including research, doctoral, comprehensive, and 2-year) offered their permanent full-time non-instructional faculty the option of early or phased retirement (59.2, 53.0, 48.1, and 52.6 percent, respectively) (table 3.3). Of the permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who accepted early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992, 30 percent were employed by public research institutions and another 24 percent were employed by public 2-year institutions (table 3.3). Public institutions appear to use early or phased retirement to reduce faculty appointments to a greater extent than private institutions.

Table 3.1 — **Percentage change between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 in the number of permanent full-time higher education faculty and instructional staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty
	Percent change between 1991 and 1992	Percent change between 1991 and 1992
All institutions[1]	0.6	3.1
Public research	0.1	3.5
Private research	2.4	5.1
Public doctoral[2]	0.7	1.6
Private doctoral[2]	1.2	1.5
Public comprehensive	-0.1	0.4
Private comprehensive	0.6	4.7
Private liberal arts	1.5	3.8
Public 2-year	1.0	2.2
Other[3]	-0.2	7.8

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T3.1 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 3.2 — **Percentage of permanent full-time higher education faculty and instructional staff who left institutions of higher education between 1991 and 1992, by reason for leaving and type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institutions	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff: 1991	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff			
		Percent who left	Of those who left, percentage distribution of reason for departure		
			Retirement	Downsizing	Other
All institutions[1]	506,984	6.4	37	4	59
Public research	86,058	5.8	31	2	67
Private research	32,575	6.2	27	<1	73
Public doctoral[2]	51,156	8.0	32	4	64
Private doctoral[2]	28,039	6.1	22	2	76
Public comprehensive	88,354	7.0	44	3	54
Private comprehensive	31,579	6.6	38	3	59
Private liberal arts	36,471	6.7	27	5	67
Public 2-year	109,664	5.7	50	7	43
Other[3]	43,088	6.1	35	6	59

Type and control of institutions	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty: 1991	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty			
		Percent who left	Of those who left, percentage distribution of reason for departure		
			Retirement	Downsizing	Other
All institutions[4]	54,887	7.4	26	2	72
Public research	14,955	6.7	26	2	72
Private research	2,840	9.5	13	<1	87
Public doctoral[2]	6,189	8.3	22	2	76
Private doctoral[2]	1,715	4.5	14	2	84
Public comprehensive	8,129	9.4	30	2	68
Private comprehensive	2,544	5.2	31	<1	69
Private liberal arts	2,974	7.6	30	<1	70
Public 2-year	10,511	6.4	38	2	60
Other[3]	5,032	7.9	15	<1	85

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

NOTE: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals. Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T3.2 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 3.3 — **Percentage of higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992 and percentage distribution of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff accepting early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff	
	Higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992	Faculty who took early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992
	Number	Number
	3,142	23,256
	Percent	Percent
All institutions[1]	39.7	100.0
Public research	77.0	14.5
Private research	70.4	3.0
Public doctoral[2]	65.8	9.8
Private doctoral[2]	44.8	2.4
Public comprehensive	54.4	19.4
Private comprehensive	55.2	4.6
Private liberal arts	32.8	5.9
Public 2-year	48.7	32.1
Other[3]	10.6	8.1

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	
	Higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992	Faculty who took early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992
	Number	Number
	1,881	2,293
	Percent	Percent
All institutions[4]	30.3	100.0
Public research	59.2	30.1
Private research	31.3	1.4
Public doctoral[2]	53.0	12.2
Private doctoral[2]	20.2	0.6
Public comprehensive	48.1	19.8
Private comprehensive	20.3	5.8
Private liberal arts	7.3	4.6
Public 2-year	52.6	24.0
Other[3]	7.4	1.5

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

NOTE: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals. Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T3.3 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

SECTION 4

THE TENURE SYSTEM

Often the focus of intense debate in higher education, tenure systems, nonetheless, remain common in most types of colleges and universities. This section focuses on tenure systems and tenured faculty in different types of higher education institutions. It includes an examination of institutions with tenure systems, and the percentages of tenured permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff and tenured permanent full-time non-instructional faculty. It also examines the percentages of institutions that limit time on a tenure track and the prevalence of specific actions related to the tenure system in the 5 years prior to the survey.

Tenure Systems and Faculty Tenure

Permanent Full-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff

In the fall of 1992, tenure systems for full-time instructional faculty and staff existed in 71 percent of all higher education institutions. Virtually all[17] public research, private research, public doctoral, and public comprehensive institutions had tenure systems for this group of instructional faculty and staff. In contrast, only 66 percent of public 2-year institutions had tenure systems (table 4.1).

In the fall of 1992, 58 percent of all permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff had tenure (table 4.1). Another 24 percent of this group of instructional faculty and staff were on a tenure track, but not tenured in the fall of 1992. For most types of institutions, 80 percent or more of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff had tenure or were on a tenure track. The exceptions were public 2-year institutions and "other" types of institutions where only 66 and 63 percent, respectively, of the permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff had tenure or were on a tenure track (table 4.1).

Permanent Full-Time Non-Instructional Faculty

In 1992, permanent full-time non-instructional faculty were employed by 1,881 institutions; 47 percent of these institutions had tenure systems for this group of faculty (table 4.1). While 58 percent of all permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff had tenure and another 24 percent were on a tenure track in 1992, only 23 percent of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty had tenure and 7 percent were on a tenure track, but not tenured.

---

[17] Even though the estimates indicate that 100 percent of public research, private research, public doctoral, and public comprehensive institutions had tenure systems for their permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, the reader is reminded that the estimates in this report are derived from a sample and are subject to sampling error and nonresponse. Therefore, it is possible that some public research, private research, public doctoral, and public comprehensive institutions did not have a tenure system for their permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff in the fall of 1992. See the *Technical Notes* for a discussion of the sample design, the survey methodology, the weight calculations, and the accuracy of the estimates.

There was considerable variation across institutional types in the percent of institutions that had a tenure system for their permanent non-instructional faculty and in the percent of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who were tenured or on a tenure track. The percent of institutions with a tenure system for permanent non-instructional faculty ranged from 20 percent of private doctoral institutions to 70 percent of public comprehensive institutions. The percent of permanent non-instructional faculty with tenure or on a tenure track ranged from only about 5 percent in private research institutions to about 50 percent in public 2-year institutions (table 4.1).

Number of Permanent Full-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff Considered for and Granted Tenure

Permanent Full-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff

During the 1992-93 academic year, 20 percent of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff who were on a tenure track were considered for tenure. Of those considered, 73 percent were granted tenure (table 4.2). There was little variation in the percent of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff granted tenure by institutional type. One exception was the smaller than average percent of such faculty in public comprehensive institutions who were granted tenure (61 percent) (table 4.2).

Permanent Full-Time Non-Instructional Faculty

In 1992, 13 percent of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who were on a tenure track were considered for tenure; tenure was granted to 89 percent of those considered for tenure (table 4.2).

Institutions That Limit Time on Tenure Track and the Maximum Number of Years Allowable on Tenure Track

Permanent Full-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff

In 1992, 83 percent of the 2,240 institutions of higher education with tenure systems limited the time that permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff could spend on a tenure track (table 4.3).

Of those institutions that imposed limitations, 22 percent specified less than 5 years as the maximum amount of time permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff were allowed to remain on a tenure track without achieving tenure; 10 percent specified 5 years; 30 percent specified 6 years; 34 percent specified 7 years; and only 5 percent specified over 7 years (table 4.3).

There was variation across institutional types in the distribution of maximum number of years that permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff were allowed to remain on a tenure track. The majority of colleges and universities in most types of institutions limited the amount of time on a tenure track to either 6 or 7 years and very few had limitations of less than 5 or greater than 7 years. Exceptions included public 2-year institutions, where 61 percent of institutions limited time on a tenure track to under 5 years; and private research and other institutions, where 30 and 26 percent, respectively, had limits of greater than 7 years (table 4.3).

Permanent Full-Time Non-Instructional Faculty

In 1992, 76 percent of the institutions with tenure systems for permanent full-time non-instructional faculty limited the time that these faculty could spend on a tenure track. A substantial percentage of institutions (31.4 percent) limited time on a tenure track to less than 5 years, although one-half of institutions had time limits of 6 or 7 years (22.9 and 28.0 percent, respectively) (table 4.3). Two-thirds of public 2-year institutions with tenure systems limited the time on tenure track to less than 5 years for their permanent full-time non-instructional faculty. Forty percent of private research institutions limited time spent on a tenure track to 5 years, while another 40 percent of private research institutions limited time spent on tenure track to 6 or 7 years. Additionally, about one-half of private doctoral institutions with tenure systems had limits that exceeded 7 years (table 4.3).

Institutions That Have Taken Specified Actions Related to Tenure

Permanent Full-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff

A number of institutions took specific actions related to tenure in the five years preceding the survey. These included replacing tenured positions with fixed-term positions, raising tenure standards, and taking other actions designed to lower the percent of tenured full-time instructional faculty and staff.[18] Specifically, 23 percent of all institutions with tenure systems for permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff made the standards for granting tenure to this group of faculty and staff more stringent between the fall of 1987 and the fall of 1992. Additionally, 18 percent replaced some tenured or tenure-track permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff positions with fixed-term contract positions during this time period. Finally, 8 percent took other actions designed to lower the percent of tenured permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff (table 4.4).

Permanent Full-Time Non-Instructional Faculty

Between the fall of 1987 and the fall of 1992, 17 percent of all institutions employing full-time non-instructional faculty made the standards for granting tenure to this group of faculty more stringent. Further, 6 percent of the institutions replaced some tenured or tenure-track permanent full-time non-instructional faculty positions with fixed-term contract positions and 7 percent took other actions designed to lower the percent of tenured permanent full-time non-instructional faculty during this time period[19] (table 4.4).

---

[18] A review of all verbatim responses indicates that the 'other' actions taken most often for full-time permanent instructional faculty and staff involved downsizing, redefining positions as non-tenured, and offering early retirement incentives.

[19] A review of all verbatim responses indicates that the 'other' actions taken most often for full-time permanent non-instructional faculty and staff involved downsizing, redefining positions as non-tenured, and offering early retirement incentives.

A significantly higher than average proportion of public doctoral institutions replaced some tenured or tenure-track permanent full-time non-instructional faculty positions with fixed-term positions (34 percent compared with 6 percent for all institutions). In addition, public research institutions were twice as likely as all institutions (14 percent versus 7 percent) to have taken other actions between 1987 and 1992 to limit the percent of tenured permanent full-time non-instructional faculty (table 4.4).

Table 4.1 — Percentage of institutions with tenure systems for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and percentage with tenure, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff			
		Percent of institutions with tenure systems	Percent of faculty tenured in 1992	Percent of faculty on tenure track in 1992	Percent of faculty not on tenure track or no tenure system in 1992
All institutions[1]	3,142	71.3	57.6	23.6	18.8
Public research	70	100.0	68.8	21.0	10.2
Private research	32	100.0	55.9	30.5	13.6
Public doctoral[2]	94	100.0	57.9	26.1	16.0
Private doctoral[2]	82	91.9	50.7	32.9	16.4
Public comprehensive	341	100.0	67.6	28.1	4.3
Private comprehensive	262	85.3	54.1	29.5	16.4
Private liberal arts	573	79.9	47.5	33.5	19.0
Public 2-year	1,012	66.0	52.5	13.9	33.6
Other[3]	676	41.1	45.3	17.4	37.3

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty			
		Percent of institutions with tenure systems	Percent of faculty tenured in 1992	Percent of faculty on tenure track in 1992	Percent of faculty not on tenure track or no tenure system in 1992
All institutions[4]	1,881	47.0	22.7	6.7	70.6
Public research	57	57.1	18.9	4.6	76.5
Private research	18	33.3	3.4	1.4	95.2
Public doctoral[2]	62	53.0	14.6	4.2	81.2
Private doctoral[2]	52	19.6	8.5	0.7	90.8
Public comprehensive	235	71.3	33.1	12.6	54.3
Private comprehensive	175	50.3	18.1	8.6	73.3
Private liberal arts	321	40.3	8.3	12.4	79.3
Public 2-year	539	62.0	39.1	8.7	52.2
Other[3]	421	19.7	20.3	3.4	76.3

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

NOTE: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals. Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T4.1 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 4.2 — **Percentage of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff considered for tenure and of those considered, the percentage who were granted tenure during the 1992-93 academic year, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Percent of 1992 permanent full-time tenure track instructional faculty and staff considered for tenure	Percent of 1992 permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff considered for tenure who were granted tenure
All institutions[1]	19.8	73.4
Public research	22.2	79.6
Private research	8.8	74.6
Public doctoral[2]	17.5	74.1
Private doctoral[2]	12.7	75.9
Public comprehensive	22.3	61.0
Private comprehensive	22.0	74.3
Private liberal arts	15.0	71.9
Public 2-year	26.7	78.3
Other[3]	24.1	83.8

Type and control of institution	Percent of 1992 permanent full-time tenure track non-instructional faculty considered for tenure	Percent of 1992 permanent full-time non-instructional faculty considered for tenure who were granted tenure
All institutions[4]	12.8	88.7
Public research	7.1	90.7
Private research	5.6	100.0
Public doctoral[2]	15.3	88.6
Private doctoral[2]	20.0	100.0
Public comprehensive	13.2	89.5
Private comprehensive	7.4	89.7
Private liberal arts	0.6	0.0
Public 2-year	23.3	87.5
Other[3]	10.0	100.0

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T4.2 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 4.3 — **Percentage of institutions that limit time on tenure track for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and percentage distribution of the maximum number of years on a tenure track without tenure, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff						
	Number of institutions with tenure systems	Percent of institutions that limit time on tenure track	Institutions with time limits of:				
			<5 years	5 years	6 years	7 years	>7 years
All institutions[1]	2,240	82.8	21.6	9.6	29.6	34.0	5.2
Public research	70	98.3	1.7	1.7	35.6	50.8	10.2
Private research	32	100.0	0.0	3.7	14.8	51.9	29.6
Public doctoral[2]	94	92.9	3.0	1.3	44.9	47.5	3.3
Private doctoral[2]	76	69.3	2.2	3.9	29.2	52.0	12.7
Public comprehensive	341	88.6	0.6	15.5	43.9	37.9	2.1
Private comprehensive	223	77.0	5.0	4.5	35.9	51.9	2.7
Private liberal arts	458	72.9	0.0	6.1	39.4	54.5	0.0
Public 2-year	668	89.5	61.4	12.4	12.0	13.2	1.0
Other[3]	278	75.4	8.9	11.3	32.0	22.2	25.6

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty						
	Number of institutions with tenure systems	Percent of institutions that limit time on tenure track	Institutions with time limits of:				
			<5 years	5 years	6 years	7 years	>7 years
All institutions[4]	884	76.3	31.4	9.7	22.9	28.0	8.0
Public research	33	96.4	0.0	11.1	29.6	44.4	14.8
Private research	6	100.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
Public doctoral[2]	33	80.6	0.0	4.4	59.3	31.9	4.4
Private doctoral[2]	10	88.5	0.0	0.0	13.0	38.9	48.1
Public comprehensive	168	83.7	7.3	16.0	40.3	30.9	5.4
Private comprehensive	88	76.0	0.0	11.5	39.0	45.1	4.4
Private liberal arts	129	46.3	30.1	0.0	43.0	26.8	0.0
Public 2-year	334	80.6	66.9	10.4	6.9	15.8	0.0
Other[3]	83	78.1	3.5	0.0	0.0	45.4	51.0

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

NOTE: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals. Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T4.3 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 4.4 — **Percentage of higher education institutions that took specific actions related to tenure during the past five years, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with tenure systems	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff		
		Percent of institutions that have:		
		Replaced tenured with fixed-term positions	Raised tenure standards	Taken other actions
All institutions[1]	2,240	18.0	22.7	8.1
Public research	70	26.7	18.3	13.3
Private research	32	33.3	33.3	22.2
Public doctoral[2]	94	33.4	20.7	13.9
Private doctoral[2]	76	14.6	27.7	7.8
Public comprehensive	341	30.4	25.9	10.1
Private comprehensive	223	20.8	23.1	16.0
Private liberal arts	458	12.7	11.7	2.8
Public 2-year	668	15.0	29.6	6.7
Other[3]	278	8.6	19.6	6.8

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with tenure systems	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty		
		Percent of institutions that have:		
		Replaced tenured with fixed-term positions	Raised tenure standards	Taken other actions
All institutions[4]	884	5.7	17.0	7.2
Public research	33	10.7	17.9	14.3
Private research	6	0.0	20.0	0.0
Public doctoral[2]	33	34.2	13.7	10.3
Private doctoral[2]	10	0.0	11.5	0.0
Public comprehensive	168	9.1	15.2	9.3
Private comprehensive	88	7.1	8.1	17.3
Private liberal arts	129	4.9	9.4	0.0
Public 2-year	334	2.3	27.7	7.4
Other[3]	83	0.0	0.0	0.0

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T4.4 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

SECTION 5

FACULTY BENEFITS

Institutions of higher education typically offer faculty a variety of employee benefits. These might include retirement plans, medical insurance, dental insurance, other health-related assistance, tuition remission or grants for family members, child care, and many other options. This section examines the array of benefits that different higher education institutions provide to different groups of faculty and instructional staff.

Retirement Plans

Permanent Full-time Instructional Faculty and Staff

Virtually all institutions (97 percent) that employed permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff offered some sort of retirement plan to them in 1992 (table 5.1). Seventy-two percent made the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association/College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA/CREF) available to this type of faculty. Forty-five percent offered state plans, 44 percent offered "other 403B plans," and 15 percent made 401K or 401B plans available to staff.

There was little variation in the retirement plans offered by type and control of institution, except for public 2-year institutions and "other" institutions. About 85 percent of institutions that employed permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff offered them TIAA/CREF. Three-fourths or more of public institutions (including research, doctoral, comprehensive, and 2-year) that employed permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff offered a state retirement plan, while (not surprisingly) very few of such private institutions (including research, doctoral, comprehensive, and liberal arts) offered this type of benefit (table 5.1).

Permanent Full-time Non-instructional Faculty

Similar to permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, almost all higher education institutions that employed permanent full-time non-instructional faculty (95 percent) offered them some sort of retirement plan (table 5.2). Again, TIAA/CREF was the most frequently offered retirement plan (72 percent of all institutions offered this benefit to permanent full-time non-instructional faculty). Additionally, the vast majority of public institutions (including research, doctoral, comprehensive, and 2-year) that employed permanent full-time non-instructional faculty made a state retirement plan available to them.

Part-time Instructional Faculty and Staff

Institutions of higher education were considerably less likely to offer a retirement plan to part-time instructional faculty and staff than to either permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff or permanent full-time non-instructional faculty (tables 5.1 through 5.3). Forty-three percent of all institutions that employed part-time instructional faculty and staff offered some type of retirement plan to this type of faculty in 1992 (table 5.3). The most frequently offered retirement plans were

TIAA/CREF and state retirement plans (24.6 and 22.9 percent of higher education institutions, respectively, made these benefits available).

There was variation in the availability of different retirement plans by type and control of institution. To illustrate, less than one-third of private comprehensive, private liberal arts, and public 2-year institutions that employed part-time instructional faculty and staff offered TIAA/CREF to this type of faculty. In contrast, 69 percent of such private research institutions offered TIAA/CREF to this group of instructional faculty and staff (table 5.3).

Other Employee Benefits

Permanent Full-time Faculty and Instructional Staff

Medical insurance or medical care and life insurance were the most common benefits offered to permanent full-time faculty (i.e., instructional or noninstructional) and instructional staff by institutions of higher education in 1992 (tables 5.4 and 5.6). Almost all institutions that employed permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff offered these benefits (99 and 94 percent, respectively). At the other extreme, only about 20 percent of these higher education institutions made housing or mortgage assistance available to their permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff (tables 5.4 and 5.6).

Institutions differed with regard to the specific benefits offered to permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff. Tuition remission or grants, for example, whether available to a faculty member's spouse or children, were far more common in private institutions than in public institutions.[20] The availability of child care ranged from about 10 percent of private liberal arts institutions to about 60 percent of research (public or private) institutions (tables 5.4 and 5.6).

Temporary Full-time Faculty and Instructional Staff

Institutions that employed temporary full-time faculty (instructional or noninstructional) and instructional staff were less likely to offer them the benefits provided to permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff (tables 5.4 through 5.7). To illustrate, about one-third to one-half of the institutions that employed temporary full-time faculty and instructional staff made some form of medical insurance or medical care, disability insurance, or dental insurance or dental care available to these faculty (tables 5.5 and 5.7), while more than three-fourths of the institutions that employed permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff made similar benefits available to their permanent faculty (tables 5.4 and 5.6).

Part-time Instructional Faculty and Staff

Part-time instructional faculty and staff were less likely than permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff or permanent full-time non-instructional faculty to be offered any of the benefits listed in the survey (tables 5.4, 5.6, and 5.8). Medical insurance or medical care and a transportation or parking subsidy were the most common benefits offered to part-time instructional faculty and staff (table 5.8).

---

[20] Public institutions include research, doctoral, comprehensive, and 2-year; private institutions include research, doctoral, and liberal arts.

Eligibility Criteria for Part-time Instructional Faculty and Staff

Of the 3,091 institutions of higher education that employed part-time faculty and instructional staff in the fall of 1992, 35 percent (1,094) indicated that part-time faculty had to meet certain criteria to be eligible for benefits (table 5.9). About one-quarter (26.6 percent) of these higher education institutions used minimum hours employed per week at the institution as a criterion for benefit eligibility. Thirty-nine percent of all part-time instructional faculty and staff met this minimum hour criterion. The average number of minimum hours specified was 16.

Public research institutions were more likely than the average institution to require a minimum number of hours for part-time staff to be eligible for benefits in the fall of 1992; 69 percent of these institutions had this requirement. Public 2-year colleges were less likely than average to set this standard with 21 percent of all such institutions using a minimum number of hours as a criterion for benefit eligibility for part-time instructional faculty and staff (table 5.9).

The average number of hours used as a minimum ranged from 14 in private doctoral institutions to 19 in private liberal arts institutions (table 5.9). The percent of part-time instructional faculty and staff meeting this criterion varied from 21 percent in private comprehensive institutions to 62 percent in private doctoral institutions.

In the fall of 1992, 17 percent of all institutions that employed part-time instructional faculty and staff used a minimum length of employment to determine their eligibility for benefits (table 5.9). About one-half of such public research institutions used this criterion to determine eligibility, but only 23 percent of private research institutions used this as a standard. The minimum length of employment required for part-time instructional faculty and staff to be eligible for benefits exceeded 1 academic year in 6 percent of higher education institutions; 41 percent of all part-time faculty met this criterion (table 5.9).

Table 5.1 — Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Institutions with permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff	Retirement plans					
		Any retirement plan	TIAA/ CREF	Other 403B	State plan	401K or 401B	Other retirement
All institutions[1]	3,142	96.8	72.4	44.1	44.9	15.3	28.0
Public research	70	100.0	90.0	81.7	75.0	25.0	40.0
Private research	32	100.0	92.6	74.1	3.7	11.1	25.9
Public doctoral[2]	94	100.0	91.0	80.6	87.3	14.5	27.8
Private doctoral[2]	82	100.0	86.5	64.6	2.4	6.7	31.1
Public comprehensive	341	100.0	86.8	64.3	85.5	18.3	35.3
Private comprehensive	262	100.0	96.1	52.7	1.6	14.7	16.0
Private liberal arts	573	97.4	88.4	41.4	3.3	15.3	29.2
Public 2-year	1,012	99.8	53.6	39.3	87.2	16.0	25.9
Other[3]	676	87.8	63.3	27.0	11.4	13.3	29.5

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.
[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.
[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.1 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 5.2 — Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	Retirement plans					
		Any retirement plan	TIAA/ CREF	Other 403B	State plan	401K or 401B	Other retirement
All institutions[1]	1,881	94.6	71.8	48.3	42.0	15.3	25.9
Public research	57	100.0	81.6	81.6	77.6	22.4	38.8
Private research	18	93.3	86.7	80.0	0.0	13.3	20.0
Public doctoral[2]	62	100.0	88.7	83.6	86.3	17.8	32.9
Private doctoral[2]	52	100.0	78.7	57.2	0.0	4.5	39.2
Public comprehensive	235	100.0	86.7	61.8	81.9	17.2	32.6
Private comprehensive	175	100.0	94.2	44.0	0.0	18.6	14.9
Private liberal arts	321	97.1	81.8	49.9	1.3	19.4	24.5
Public 2-year	539	99.6	61.4	43.0	86.0	15.8	28.4
Other[3]	421	78.8	54.5	35.9	7.7	9.2	20.5

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.
[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.
[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.2 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 5.3 — **Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Institutions with part-time instructional faculty/staff	Retirement plans					
		Any retirement plan	TIAA/ CREF	Other 403B	State plan	401K or 401B	Other retirement
All institutions[1]	3,091	42.5	24.6	16.7	22.9	4.4	10.3
Public research	71	77.0	63.9	63.9	62.3	18.0	24.6
Private research	30	73.1	69.2	65.4	7.7	7.7	7.7
Public doctoral[2]	94	73.7	59.5	48.5	60.5	9.0	14.5
Private doctoral[2]	79	46.9	41.4	32.4	3.9	1.5	8.4
Public comprehensive	339	58.3	37.2	28.9	47.0	6.9	17.6
Private comprehensive	257	31.2	23.9	16.9	0.0	5.5	2.3
Private liberal arts	525	31.3	31.3	12.5	0.0	3.7	2.2
Public 2-year	1,005	48.7	14.5	12.1	40.9	4.7	12.8
Other[3]	691	29.0	15.6	7.4	4.7	1.3	10.4

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with part-time instructional faculty and staff that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.
[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.
[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.3 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 5.4 — Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Institutions with permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff	Benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
All institutions[1]	3,142	43.3	99.3	80.9	90.5	93.8	67.5	69.4	29.4
Public research	70	65.0	100.0	95.0	98.3	98.3	40.0	48.3	60.0
Private research	32	70.4	100.0	88.9	100.0	100.0	74.1	96.3	59.3
Public doctoral[2]	94	72.6	100.0	95.1	97.5	98.8	42.0	49.4	48.5
Private doctoral[2]	82	42.6	100.0	94.3	94.7	88.4	87.6	92.8	35.3
Public comprehensive	341	48.5	99.0	87.0	93.0	98.3	44.8	44.3	45.2
Private comprehensive	262	43.1	100.0	80.2	100.0	97.0	100.0	100.0	20.8
Private liberal arts	573	42.0	100.0	72.1	96.6	91.7	91.4	98.8	18.0
Public 2-year	1,012	46.2	99.7	92.5	88.9	96.2	58.6	55.7	38.6
Other[3]	676	30.0	97.6	62.8	80.1	87.5	62.8	66.8	12.7

Type and control of institution	Institutions with permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff	Benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
All institutions[1]	3,142	16.9	16.7	56.8	83.2	61.0	66.7	27.8
Public research	70	18.3	8.3	76.7	90.0	75.0	95.0	25.0
Private research	32	48.1	18.5	81.5	92.6	77.8	77.8	18.5
Public doctoral[2]	94	3.7	17.0	79.9	89.8	83.6	85.8	34.0
Private doctoral[2]	82	10.9	6.7	53.5	87.0	48.6	67.4	36.8
Public comprehensive	341	8.2	13.9	71.2	87.4	66.1	87.9	24.8
Private comprehensive	262	4.3	12.1	59.4	93.5	66.1	55.0	19.4
Private liberal arts	573	26.8	30.0	63.9	86.1	58.6	55.5	40.5
Public 2-year	1,012	4.4	7.5	51.9	88.6	69.6	82.9	27.4
Other[3]	676	37.5	24.6	44.0	63.9	42.0	39.7	21.2

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.4 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 5.5 — Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Institutions with temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff	Benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
All institutions[1]	3,133	25.7	45.2	38.1	38.8	38.1	24.9	24.0	19.5
Public research	70	41.7	71.7	61.7	60.0	60.0	23.3	21.7	38.3
Private research	30	57.7	73.1	61.5	61.5	61.5	38.5	50.0	38.5
Public doctoral[2]	94	53.7	62.7	60.2	47.3	56.5	24.7	22.6	37.1
Private doctoral[2]	78	19.5	49.8	43.8	40.8	36.1	39.3	36.3	10.5
Public comprehensive	337	43.5	70.5	60.8	60.3	61.3	22.4	20.3	37.2
Private comprehensive	258	20.5	48.3	34.7	39.4	38.7	38.2	35.9	9.0
Private liberal arts	548	18.2	47.1	27.7	38.6	34.6	27.4	28.4	13.2
Public 2-year	1,002	31.5	55.3	49.7	46.9	46.7	31.2	29.0	28.1
Other[3]	714	10.8	9.9	13.7	12.9	12.4	8.6	8.8	3.6

Type and control of institution	Institutions with temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff	Benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
All institutions[1]	3,133	2.7	7.0	34.1	32.2	26.7	20.2	11.2
Public research	70	8.3	6.7	63.3	56.7	53.3	45.0	13.3
Private research	30	15.4	7.7	61.5	46.2	42.3	30.8	11.5
Public doctoral[2]	94	2.5	12.0	64.8	44.8	43.6	32.1	20.1
Private doctoral[2]	78	3.0	1.5	24.0	22.5	18.0	7.5	6.0
Public comprehensive	337	2.3	8.8	63.0	54.7	48.9	45.5	15.7
Private comprehensive	258	3.0	8.5	35.7	32.9	26.1	7.8	8.7
Private liberal arts	548	5.8	13.3	34.5	21.6	12.1	9.7	10.6
Public 2-year	1,002	1.4	3.1	34.4	43.9	36.7	30.1	14.4
Other[3]	714	1.1	6.1	12.2	9.5	8.9	3.8	5.3

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.5 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 5.6 — Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	Benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
All institutions[1]	1,881	43.9	98.7	80.0	88.4	93.5	68.7	69.3	27.1
Public research	57	63.3	100.0	95.9	98.0	100.0	36.7	46.9	57.1
Private research	18	73.3	100.0	86.7	100.0	100.0	80.0	86.7	60.0
Public doctoral[2]	62	67.6	100.0	98.1	96.2	100.0	48.4	48.8	48.8
Private doctoral[2]	52	58.7	100.0	91.0	91.7	100.0	83.4	85.7	41.3
Public comprehensive	235	51.1	99.2	87.1	91.4	97.6	41.3	39.8	49.2
Private comprehensive	175	41.3	100.0	79.7	100.0	98.4	97.8	100.0	20.9
Private liberal arts	321	33.4	100.0	73.1	93.9	93.4	95.3	100.0	10.1
Public 2-year	539	50.2	99.7	92.7	90.8	95.7	66.0	61.0	35.3
Other[3]	421	31.8	95.2	58.8	71.4	83.5	60.3	63.4	9.6

Type and control of institution	Institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	Benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
All institutions[1]	1,881	19.3	19.8	56.4	80.1	59.3	64.2	28.6
Public research	57	18.4	10.2	81.6	85.7	75.5	95.9	20.4
Private research	18	20.0	6.7	86.7	93.3	80.0	73.3	20.0
Public doctoral[2]	62	8.0	23.9	82.2	86.8	79.3	84.5	32.9
Private doctoral[2]	52	13.5	10.6	72.9	86.4	44.9	48.8	42.1
Public comprehensive	235	8.7	14.0	78.2	89.6	71.1	90.5	28.4
Private comprehensive	175	4.1	12.4	53.4	90.9	62.2	56.3	26.1
Private liberal arts	321	24.2	29.7	49.2	72.7	47.8	55.7	48.3
Public 2-year	539	3.3	6.7	56.8	86.9	72.8	78.8	21.0
Other[3]	421	50.9	37.7	39.8	64.2	38.9	35.0	23.6

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.
[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.
[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.6 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 5.7 — Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any temporary full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Institutions with temporary full-time non-instructional faculty	Benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
All institutions[1]	1,803	23.7	38.5	35.7	33.0	33.6	22.8	23.0	16.6
Public research	55	34.0	63.8	55.3	55.3	59.6	19.1	17.0	29.8
Private research	18	60.0	53.3	60.0	53.3	53.3	40.0	46.7	46.7
Public doctoral[2]	65	48.0	57.0	57.0	51.6	57.0	25.1	23.8	38.6
Private doctoral[2]	46	12.9	20.6	18.0	20.6	20.6	18.0	15.5	5.2
Public comprehensive	224	32.8	47.7	43.2	41.0	45.2	14.3	13.3	27.5
Private comprehensive	166	8.3	39.9	36.5	30.7	28.9	27.2	28.5	6.8
Private liberal arts	285	13.2	33.3	23.3	23.9	20.9	20.9	22.4	9.1
Public 2-year	524	30.1	51.7	49.0	45.9	46.6	35.8	36.1	24.5
Other[3]	421	18.7	15.3	18.4	14.7	15.3	10.8	10.8	5.0

Type and control of institution	Institutions with temporary full-time non-instructional faculty	Benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
All institutions[1]	1,803	3.5	9.2	30.3	26.7	22.5	19.4	7.4
Public research	55	6.4	8.5	57.4	57.4	55.3	46.8	14.9
Private research	18	6.7	13.3	60.0	40.0	40.0	33.3	6.7
Public doctoral[2]	65	3.6	15.2	59.2	44.4	42.6	31.0	19.8
Private doctoral[2]	46	0.0	0.0	12.9	15.5	12.9	5.2	2.6
Public comprehensive	224	1.7	8.1	42.8	38.9	31.4	30.0	10.4
Private comprehensive	166	1.0	2.2	24.1	24.4	20.9	5.1	6.5
Private liberal arts	285	11.9	15.6	17.9	16.8	9.9	9.3	2.8
Public 2-year	524	2.1	4.6	36.6	37.0	32.1	28.0	6.8
Other[3]	421	1.3	13.9	19.4	8.8	7.9	11.0	7.7

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with temporary full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.
[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.
[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.7 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 5.8 — Percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Institutions with any part-time instructional faculty/staff	Benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
All institutions[1]	3,091	21.2	35.0	25.0	23.6	25.1	17.0	14.9	14.1
Public research	71	47.5	73.8	68.9	67.2	65.6	23.0	24.6	42.6
Private research	30	57.7	76.9	57.7	50.0	57.7	23.1	30.8	42.3
Public doctoral[2]	94	51.2	73.1	67.9	57.4	65.4	24.1	20.7	34.9
Private doctoral[2]	79	15.8	40.3	31.4	27.9	17.3	30.9	27.9	12.4
Public comprehensive	339	30.1	47.0	36.8	39.4	37.1	13.8	13.3	28.7
Private comprehensive	257	10.8	27.0	16.9	9.5	14.0	16.7	13.8	9.0
Private liberal arts	525	28.0	36.9	24.5	23.3	21.7	20.9	20.4	10.3
Public 2-year	1,005	17.2	29.1	18.4	20.6	19.5	14.6	11.4	13.2
Other[3]	691	13.6	27.4	19.8	15.0	24.0	15.6	13.2	6.1

Type and control of institution	Institutions with any part-time instructional faculty/staff	Benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
All institutions[1]	3,091	3.3	10.1	32.0	20.7	16.9	15.7	9.1
Public research	71	6.6	6.6	65.6	59.0	52.5	65.6	16.4
Private research	30	15.4	3.8	73.1	57.7	50.0	50.0	11.5
Public doctoral[2]	94	2.5	15.7	67.3	54.6	52.1	46.9	18.8
Private doctoral[2]	79	1.5	0.0	21.3	20.8	12.4	21.5	5.4
Public comprehensive	339	2.9	9.6	46.5	31.7	28.3	25.4	8.1
Private comprehensive	257	0.7	6.6	27.8	10.1	9.6	8.9	2.8
Private liberal arts	525	6.4	20.7	42.4	21.8	21.0	13.7	13.5
Public 2-year	1,005	0.6	1.8	21.1	13.0	13.0	11.5	7.1
Other[3]	691	5.6	16.6	25.8	19.3	7.3	9.5	9.6

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with part-time instructional faculty and staff that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.8 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table 5.9 — Percentage of higher education institutions with criteria for benefit eligibility for part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Institutions with part-time instructional faculty/staff	Institutions with any criteria	Minimum hours per week			Minimum length of employment		
			Percent of institutions	Average hours	Percent of faculty meeting minimum	Percent of institutions	Percent more than one academic year	Percent of faculty meeting minimum
All institutions[1]	3,091	1,094	26.6	15.8	39.1	16.6	6.1	40.8
Public research	71	57	68.9	17.0	47.8	49.2	8.2	45.3
Private research	30	21	42.3	18.3	51.1	23.1	3.8	66.2
Public doctoral[2]	94	73	58.3	16.7	46.5	34.0	13.0	48.4
Private doctoral[2]	79	36	37.3	13.8	62.0	25.5	21.0	36.9
Public comprehensive	339	168	35.8	15.1	42.7	29.2	8.5	39.4
Private comprehensive	257	90	27.2	14.1	21.3	20.6	11.7	29.9
Private liberal arts	525	153	23.8	19.1	42.4	15.4	7.9	49.9
Public 2-year	1,005	277	20.8	14.2	32.7	14.6	5.1	39.0
Other[3]	691	220	21.7	16.3	39.4	5.6	0.0	34.4

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with part-time instructional faculty and staff that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

NOTE: Standard errors for each estimate in this table can be found in Table T5.9 of the *Technical Notes*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

SECTION 6

SUMMARY

Institutions of higher education in the United States employed approximately 1 million faculty and instructional staff in the fall of 1992, and 90 percent had instruction as their major regular assignment. Two-thirds of all faculty were employed by public institutions (research, doctoral, comprehensive, and 2-year) and one-third were employed by public 2-year institutions (table 2.3).

There was about a 1 percent increase in the number of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff employed by institutions of higher education in the United States between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992, and about a 3 percent increase in the number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty during this same time period (table 3.1). This increase occurred despite the fact that 6 percent of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff left the institutions at which they were employed because of retirement, downsizing, or reasons other than retirement or downsizing (table 3.2).

Between 1987 and 1992, 40 percent of all higher education institutions offered early or phased retirement to permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff and approximately 23,300 took advantage of the offer. Additionally, 30 percent of the 1,800 higher education institutions employing permanent full-time non-instructional faculty offered early or phased retirement to their faculty and about 2,300 took advantage of the offer (table 3.3).

In the fall of 1992, 71 percent of all higher education institutions had a tenure system for permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, but only 47 percent had a tenure system for permanent full-time non-instructional faculty (table 4.1). Additionally, 4-year institutions were much more likely than 2-year institutions to have a tenure system for their permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff (table 4.1).

While 58 percent of all permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff had tenure in 1992, only 23 percent of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty had tenure (table 4.1). Of those considered for tenure in 1992, permanent full-time non-instructional faculty were more likely to be granted tenure than permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff (table 4.2).

Eighty-three percent of higher education institutions with tenure systems placed a limit on the maximum amount of time that permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff could remain on tenure track. Compared with all institutions, public 2-year institutions were more likely to limit the maximum amount of time on a tenure track to less than 5 years for both permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff and permanent full-time non-instructional faculty (table 4.3). Finally, between the fall of 1987 and the fall of 1992, almost one-half of the higher education institutions had taken some action to lower the percentage of tenured full-time instructional faculty and staff (table 4.4).

Virtually all institutions of higher education offered some sort of retirement plan to both permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff and permanent full-time non-instructional faculty in 1992 (tables 5.1 and 5.2); only 43 percent of institutions that employed part-time instructional faculty and staff offered some type of a retirement plan to this type of faculty (table 5.3). Part-time instructional faculty and staff also were less likely than permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff to be offered any of the employee benefits listed in the survey (tables 5.4, 5.6, and 5.8).

APPENDIX A

TECHNICAL NOTES

TECHNICAL NOTES

Overview

The 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The study received additional support from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). It was conducted by NORC, the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, under contract to NCES.

The first cycle of NSOPF was conducted in 1987-88 (NSOPF-88) with a sample of 480 institutions (including 2-year, 4-year, doctoral-granting, and other colleges and universities), over 3,000 department chairpersons, and over 11,000 faculty. The second cycle of NSOPF, conducted in 1992-93, was limited to surveys of institutions and faculty, but with a substantially expanded sample of 974 public and private nonproprietary higher education institutions and 31,354 faculty. The study was designed to provide a national profile of faculty: their professional backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes.

Institution Universe

The definition of the institution universe for NSOPF-93 was identical to the one used in NSOPF-88. It included institutions in the traditional sector of higher education: that is, institutions whose accreditation at the college level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education, that provide formal instructional programs of at least two years' duration, that are public or private not-for-profit, and that are designed primarily for students who have completed the requirements for a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Faculty Universe

Unlike NSOPF-88, which was limited to faculty whose regular assignment included instruction, the faculty universe for NSOPF-93 was expanded to include all those who were designated as faculty, whether or not their responsibilities included instruction, and other (non-faculty) personnel with instructional responsibilities. Under this definition, researchers and administrators and other institutional staff who hold faculty positions, but who do not teach, were included in the sample. Instructional staff without faculty status also were included. In summary, the eligible universe was defined to include:

- full- and part-time personnel whose regular assignment included instruction;
- full- and part-time individuals with faculty status whose regular assignment did not include instruction;
- permanent and temporary personnel with any instructional duties, including adjunct, acting, or visiting status;
- faculty and instructional personnel on sabbatical leave.

Excluded from the NSOPF-93 universe of faculty were:

- faculty and other personnel with instructional duties outside the U.S. (but not on sabbatical leave);
- temporary replacements for faculty and other instructional personnel;
- faculty and other instructional and non-instructional personnel on leave without pay;
- graduate teaching assistants;
- military personnel who taught only ROTC courses;
- instructional personnel supplied by independent contractors.

Sample Design

A two-stage stratified clustered probability design was used to select the NSOPF-93 sample. The first-stage NSOPF-93 sampling frame consisted of the 3,256 postsecondary institutions that provided formal instructional programs of at least two years' duration and that were public or private, not-for-profit, drawn from the 1991-92 IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System[1]) Institutional Characteristics Survey. The sampling frame was sorted by type and control of institution to create groups of institutions called strata. The selection of institutions occurred independently within each stratum.

A modified Carnegie[2] classification system was used to stratify institutions according to cross-classification of control by type, first into 17 cells, and then into 15 strata. There were two levels of control, public and private, and nine types of institutions including:

1. Research universities (public or private): The 100 leading universities receiving federal research funds. Each of these universities awards substantial numbers of doctorates across many fields;

---

[1] IPEDS is a recurring set of surveys developed and maintained by NCES. Postsecondary education is defined by IPEDS as "the provision of a formal instructional program whose curriculum is designed primarily for students who have completed the requirements for a high school diploma or its equivalent." This definition includes programs whose purpose is academic, vocational and continuing professional education and excludes avocational and adult basic education. IPEDS encompasses all institutional providers of postsecondary education in the United States and its outlying areas. For more information on IPEDS data used in this study, see National Center for Education Statistics, *IPEDS Manual for Users* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1991). This manual is also distributed with IPEDS data on CD-ROM.

[2] See *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education,* (Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), 1987. Out of the 3,256 institutions, 278 could not be classified. Carnegie staff supplied updates for 81 institutions; the remaining group of unclassified institutions were designated as "unknown" on the NSOPF-93 sampling frame.

2. Other Ph.D. (public or private): Other doctoral-granting universities not included among the 100 leading universities receiving federal research funds;[3]

3. Comprehensive colleges and universities (public or private): Offering liberal arts and professional programs. Master's degrees are the highest degrees offered;

4. Liberal arts colleges (public or private): Smaller and generally more selective than comprehensive colleges and universities. Primarily offering bachelor's degrees, although some offer master's degrees;

5. Two-year colleges (public or private): Offering associate's degrees;

6. Independent medical institutions (public or private): Those not considered as part of a 4-year college or university;

7. Religious colleges (private only);

8. Other (public/private): Includes a wide range of professional and other specialized degree-granting colleges and universities; and

9. Unknown (public/private): Carnegie classification was unknown.

First Stage Sampling

Since there are no public religious institutions, the cross-classification of control by type had 17 cells. However, the desired sampling rates for three of the cells—public research, private research, and public "other Ph.D."—were so close to 100 percent that it was appropriate to sample all of the institutions in those cells. Therefore, a single sampling stratum was constructed for these institutions, and all institutions were selected in that stratum (i.e., selected with certainty). Grouping these institutions together was appropriate from a sampling design and selection standpoint, although this stratum does not comprise a group of analytic interest.

Institutions in the 14 other strata[4] were referred to as "noncertainty" institutions. The stratum sample sizes, determined by a preliminary pass through the 14 strata, were allocated proportional to the total estimated number of faculty and instructional staff in each stratum. In those strata, the first stage selections were made using stratified sampling with probabilities within each stratum proportional to the expected numbers of faculty and instructional staff. Systematic probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling was used with measure of size (MOS) equal to 41 or the estimated number of faculty (and instructional staff), whichever was larger. MOS was defined as the total number of faculty and instructional staff as specified in the most recent IPEDS Fall Staff Survey available (1989-90). Of the

---

[3] "Other Ph.D." institutions are included in the institutions noted as "Doctoral" in the body of the report.

[4] The "noncertainty" sampling strata were broken down as follows: private, other Ph.D.; public, comprehensive; private, comprehensive; public, liberal arts; private, liberal arts; public, medical; private, medical; private, religious (there are no public religious colleges); public, two-year; private, two-year; public, other; private, other; public, unknown; and private, unknown.

3,256 institutions listed on the sample frame, 3,106 had a MOS available. For the remaining 150 (4.6 percent) institutions for which faculty data were missing, MOS was imputed.

In systematic sampling, the order in which the institutions are listed on the frame is important, as it reflects an implicit stratification. Within each stratum the institutions were sorted by MOS in a "serpentine" manner, i.e., if one stratum was in ascending order by MOS, the next was descending, the one after that was ascending, and so on. This procedure helped to balance the sample with respect to institution size (based on number of faculty). A total of 789 institutions were initially selected and later supplemented with 185 institutions for a total of 974 selected in the first-stage.

Institutions were selected in two replicates. The first replicate "Pool 1" contained the initial sample of noncertainty and certainty institutions. The second replicate "Pool 2" was sorted into random order within strata and contained only noncertainty institutions. Institutions that were determined ineligible or could not be recruited after extensive follow-up were replaced at random by institutions within the same explicit stratum in Pool 2. Replacement institutions for the certainty stratum were selected at random from similar strata. ("Other Ph.D.," "Public Comprehensive," and "Private Comprehensive" sampling strata were used for this purpose.)

Second Stage Sampling

At the second stage of sample selection, the NSOPF-93 sampling frame consisted of lists of faculty and instructional staff obtained from 817 participating institutions. Each institution was randomly assigned a target total sample size, say *n*, of either 41 or 42 faculty to yield the desired average sample size of 41.5. Whenever an institution had fewer than 42 individuals, all faculty and instructional staff were selected. Otherwise, the following oversampling sizes[5] were used to select groups to ensure their adequate representation in the sample and to meet NSF and NEH analytic objectives: full-time females (3.36), blacks or Hispanics (5.60), Asians or Pacific Islanders (1.12), faculty in four NEH disciplines (2.24)—philosophy/religion, foreign languages, English language and literature, and history—and all others (0.00). All listed individuals who would qualify for more than one group were assigned to the group for which the oversampling rate (here defined as the oversample size divided by the number of individuals qualifying for the group) was largest. These five groups were used as strata for sampling faculty. The residual sample size (*n* minus the sum of the oversample sizes) was allocated across the five strata in proportion to the number of faculty in the strata. Then, the total sample in each stratum (consisting of the oversample size plus the proportionally allocated residual) was specified by simple random sampling without replacement, with the sampling independent from one faculty stratum to the next. For more details about second stage sampling, refer to the forthcoming *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report.*

Data Collection and Response Rates

Prior to data collection, it was first necessary to obtain cooperation from the sampled institutions. Each institution was asked to provide annotated lists of all faculty and instructional staff according to the eligibility (and oversampling) criteria needed for second stage sampling. Between October 1992 and early March 1993, 26 institutions in the original sample were replaced by randomly selected comparable institutions (from Pool 2): 5 because they were ineligible and 21 because they were determined to be final refusals. After trying to gain cooperation from the initial sample of 789 institutions for almost six months, it was determined that a certain number of other institutions were unlikely to participate in the study. These institutions were identified in March 1993 and 159 additional institutions were randomly selected within the relevant strata (from Pool 2).

---

[5] The oversample size for a group is the difference between the expected sample size for the group and the expected sample size that would have been attained if all faculty had been sampled at the same rate, i.e., in the absence of oversampling.

Project staff tried to gain cooperation from original and replacement (or supplemental) institutions simultaneously.[6] Of the 974 institutions in the total sample, 12 (1.2 percent) were found to be ineligible.[7] Ineligible institutions included those which had closed or which had merged with other institutions, satellite campuses that were not independent units, and institutions that did not grant any degrees or certificates. A total of 817 eligible institutions agreed to participate (i.e., to provide a list of faculty and instructional staff), for a list participation rate of 84.9 percent (83.4 percent, weighted).

Faculty data collection was conducted between January and December 1993, with a two-month hiatus during July and August while most faculty and instructional staff were on summer break. The faculty survey relied on a multi-modal data collection design which combined an initial mailed questionnaire with mail and telephone prompting supplemented by computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). Questionnaire and follow-up mailings were sent out in large waves between January and July 1993 as the lists were received, sampled, and processed. Coordinators at the participating institutions who signed NCES's affidavit of nondisclosure and confidentiality also assisted in the effort by prompting nonrespondents to return their completed questionnaires to NORC. Of the 31,354 faculty and instructional staff sampled,[8] 1,590 (5.1 percent) were found to be ineligible, which included staff who were deceased or no longer at the institution, staff who did not have a Fall 1992 teaching assignment, and teaching assistants. A total of 25,780 questionnaires were completed for a response rate of 86.6 percent (84.4 percent, weighted). The overall faculty response rate (institution list participation rate × faculty questionnaire response rate) was 73.5 percent (70.4 percent, weighted).

Institution data collection was conducted between September 1993 and May 1994. The institution survey combined a mailed questionnaire with mail and telephone prompting directed at both participating (817 institutions which submitted faculty lists) and nonparticipating institutions (145 institutions), for an eligible sample of 962 institutions. For 385 (44 percent) of the self-administered questionnaires completed, the institutional coordinator who had provided the original list was the main respondent, although other institution staff usually contributed to the effort. A total of 872 institution questionnaires were completed for a response rate of 90.6 percent (93.5 percent, weighted). The findings from this report are based on responses to the institution survey.

---

[6] Since the Pool 2 institutions were additional random selections into the sample, the effect of using Pool 2 institutions is no different than if a larger number of institutions had been selected initially and the pools had not been used at all. The response rates for Pool 1 institutions, and for Pool 1 and Pool 2 institutions combined, have the same expected value. Since it is based on a larger sample, the response rate for Pool 1 and Pool 2 combined is a more accurate estimator of the population response rate.

[7] When ineligible institutions were excluded from the sample, the sum of weights for eligible institutions was 3,188, rather than the 3,256 institutions specified in the sampling frame.

[8] Initially, 33,354 faculty were sampled. To reduce costs, 2,000 nonresponding faculty and instructional staff were randomly eliminated from the sample through subsampling in August 1993. A higher proportion of part-time faculty and instructional staff were eliminated than remained; this was taken into account in the calculation of faculty weights.

Best Estimates of Faculty

In comparing the weighted estimates based on the lists of faculty and instructional staff provided by institutions with those based on the institution questionnaires, several patterns emerged that were contrary to expected results. Although some variance in the estimates based on the lists and the institution questionnaires was expected, the magnitude of the difference was larger than anticipated. This, in and of itself, was not seen as a problem since the estimates were from two different sources. What was less plausible were the trends in the estimates of part-time faculty between NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93. The institution survey showed a 5 percent increase in the estimate of part-time faculty between the fall of 1987 and the fall of 1992. The faculty survey, based on the lists of faculty and instructional staff provided by the institution, showed no change in the percentage of part-time faculty between the two points in time. The weighted estimates based on the lists also showed a 37.5 percent decrease in the number of health sciences faculty and instructional staff from the fall of 1987 to the fall of 1992. Institution recontact was necessary to resolve these discrepancies and to determine the "best estimates" of total, full- and part-time faculty and instructional staff.

The best estimates were derived following a reconciliation and verification recontact with a subset of institutions which had discrepancies of 10 percent or greater between the total number enumerated on the faculty list used for sampling and the total number reported on the institution questionnaire. The recontact effort also included 120 institutions identified by NCES as employing health sciences faculty.

Of the 760 "matched" institutions[9] (i.e., institutions which provided both a completed institution questionnaire and a list of faculty and instructional staff), 450 (59 percent) had a discrepancy of 10 percent or more between the questionnaire and the list, and 61 of the 450 had health sciences faculty.

Of the 817 institutions who provided lists of faculty and instructional staff, 509 institutions (450 with 10 percent or greater discrepancies plus an additional 59 institutions with health sciences faculty) were recontacted. Before recontacting each institution, each discrepancy was reviewed to eliminate obvious clerical or list posting errors. A best estimate was obtained for 492 (or 96.7 percent) of these institutions.

It is important to point out that 118 of the reconciled institutions were unable to provide a specific reason for the discrepancies. For the 374 that provided reasons, the most commonly cited reason was the omission of some part- or full-time faculty from the list provided for sampling faculty. This occurred for 107 institutions. Some institutions included certain types of medical faculty in one set of estimates, but not in the other. Downsizing affected faculty counts at several institutions. Another factor in the discrepancies was the time interval (in some instances a year or more) between the time the list of faculty and instructional staff was compiled and the time the institution questionnaire was completed. The list did not always include new hires for the fall term, which were counted in the institution questionnaire. Some institutions provided "full-time equivalents" (FTE's) on the institution questionnaire rather than the actual headcount of part-time staff that was requested. In some instances, however, where part-time faculty and instructional staff were overreported (on either the list or the questionnaire) the reason involved confusion between the pool of part-time or temporary staff employed by, or available to, the institution and the number actually employed during the fall semester.

---

[9] A total of 929 of the 962 eligible institutions (96.6 percent) participated in the survey in some way — either by completing an institution questionnaire or by submitting a faculty list. A total of 872 institutions completed institution questionnaires and 817 institutions provided faculty lists. Of the 817 institutions which submitted faculty lists, 760 of them also completed an institution questionnaire. Therefore, "matched" data — counts of the total number of faculty at the institution drawn from the faculty list and from the institution questionnaire — are available for only these 760 institutions.

NORC used data gathered in the recontacting effort to adjust the original list of faculty and instructional staff to incorporate recontacted institutions' best estimates into the final estimates. (Problems with health science estimates, however, could only be partly rectified by the creation of new best estimates. For a further discussion of health science estimates, see the forthcoming *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report* and the Technical Notes of future NCES publications based on the NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire.) The first step in this process used as its starting point the original list, which reported totals for full-, part-time, and total faculty and instructional staff for each of the 817 participating institutions. However, in some cases, institutions which supplied a total number did not supply a breakdown of the total number into full- and part-time components.[10] For these institutions, NORC used a two-step procedure of deriving best estimates: first, deriving "best total estimates" and, second, deriving "best full-time estimates." Best estimates for part-time staff were simply calculated by subtracting the number of full-time staff from the total number at each institution.

The next step in calculating best total estimates involved the substitution of the verified counts from the 492 institutions NORC recontacted. If an institution verified the counts from its original faculty list or was unable to confirm other estimates, the original list estimate was retained as the best estimate. If the institution verified the institution questionnaire data as a more accurate estimate, questionnaire data were substituted for original list data as the best estimate. If the institution provided a different set of estimates, the new estimates were substituted for counts based on original list data.

Institutions which were nonrespondents in the verification effort and which had discrepancies of 10 percent or greater between the estimates of faculty and instructional staff based on the lists provided by institutions and those based on the institution questionnaire were adjusted by multiplying the ratio of verified counts to original counts for the 492 recontacted institutions by the original list count. Original list data were used for the institutions which were not selected for recontact. For all 817 institutions, the source of the final best estimates was as follows:

460 (56.3 percent) used original list data;
280 (34.3 percent) used questionnaire data;
61 (7.5 percent) used new estimates (other than questionnaire or original list data); and
16 (1.9 percent) were ratio-adjusted.

---

[10] Eighty-four of the 817 institutions did not specify the employment status (i.e., full- or part-time) of faculty and instructional staff on their original lists.

During the reconciliation effort, some ineligible faculty and instructional staff were excluded from the institution-level totals. This happened if recontacted institutions reported that the original faculty list had included ineligible faculty. This information was supplied by 23 institutions. It is assumed that faculty population estimates derived from the best estimate calculations include only eligible faculty. For more discussion of the verification process and calculation of best estimates, see the forthcoming *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report.*

Weight Calculations

The weights for both the institution and faculty samples were designed to adjust for differential probabilities of selection and nonresponse. Weights for the institution sample were constructed in three steps. First, the institution's base weight—equal to the reciprocal of its probability of selection into the sample—was calculated. (This step reflected the several steps used to select the institutions from sample Pool 1 and sample Pool 2.) Second, the base weights were adjusted for institutions that had merged and so were effectively listed multiple times in the sampling frame.[11] Finally, a nonresponse adjustment factor was applied to the weights to compensate for institution-level nonresponse. A review of the data indicated that post-stratification adjustment was not needed. For a detailed description of the weighting process, see the forthcoming *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report.*

Weights for the faculty sample were computed in four steps. First, the base conditional selection probabilities were calculated; these reflected the selection rates for faculty members given that their institutions were sampled. In this step, the initial selection probabilities also were adjusted to reflect the exclusion of a random subsample of faculty. (See footnote 8.) Then the reciprocals of these selection probabilities were calculated to yield base conditional weights. Second, these weights were multiplied by the first-stage nonresponse-adjusted weights to yield second-stage sampling weights adjusted for institutional nonresponse. Third, a second-stage nonresponse adjustment factor was applied to these latter weights to compensate for nonresponse by faculty members. Fourth, the nonresponse-adjusted weights were poststratified to the best estimates of total, full-, and part-time faculty and instructional staff by sampling stratum.

The poststratification adjustment should reduce sampling variability, and more importantly reduce any reporting biases and bias due to undercoverage of the faculty sampling frame. Poststratification provides a means of weighting the faculty respondents to represent all faculty on the original faculty sampling frame as well as faculty missed on the frame. The method is entirely analogous to the nonresponse adjustment, where faculty respondents are weighted up to represent themselves as well as the faculty nonrespondents. While the nonresponse adjustment is based upon the assumption that the means of respondents and nonrespondents are similar, the poststratification adjustment is based upon the assumption that the means of covered faculty and missed faculty are similar. Neither assumption is perfect, but the resulting estimates are thought to be more accurate than they would be in the absence of the adjustments.

---

[11] After the sample was selected and institutions were contacted, NORC discovered that a few of the institutions in the sample had merged with other institutions on the sampling frame. Since a merged institution would be in the sample if any listing of the institution was selected from the frame, its weight must be reduced accordingly.

Imputation of Missing Data

Item nonresponse occurred when a respondent did not answer one or more survey questions. The item nonresponse rates were generally low for the institution and faculty questionnaires, since missing critical (and selected other) items were retrieved by interviewers. The NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire had a mean item nonresponse rate of .103 for 395 items in six sections. The NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire had a mean item nonresponse rate of .102 for 272 items in four sections.[12] Imputation for item nonresponse was performed for each survey item, to make the study results more inclusive.[13] "Don't know" responses were treated as item nonresponse and imputed for both the institution and faculty questionnaires. However, a second imputation was done for selected items in the faculty questionnaire with "don't know" responses, where this caused 30 percent or more of the responses to be eligible for imputation. In the second imputation, "don't knows" were treated as legitimate responses, and only in a case where there was no response to a survey item was imputation performed. For these items, in the second imputation, missing responses were imputed across all response categories, including the don't know category. This was done to allow researchers to choose how to treat don't knows in their analyses. Not applicable ("NA") responses were not imputed since these represented respondents who were not eligible to answer the relevant item.

Imputation was performed using several procedures. Missing gender, race, and employment status data on the faculty data file were imputed directly from information supplied by institutions on the lists used for sampling faculty and instructional staff, whenever this information was available.

Two statistical procedures, regression-based and hot-deck, were employed to impute other missing data on both data files. Regression-based imputation was used for continuous and dichotomous variables. Hot-deck imputation was used for all other variables. The type of imputation used was recorded by setting the appropriate value of the imputation flag for each survey item.

Sources of Error

The survey estimates provided in this report are subject to two sources of error: sampling errors and nonsampling errors. Sampling errors occur because the estimates are based on a sample of individuals in the population rather than on the entire population. Sampling errors can be quantified using statistical procedures in which a variance estimate — in this report, a standard error for the mean or proportion (including percent) — is calculated. The standard error measures the variability of the sample estimator in repeated sampling, using the same sample design and sample size. It indicates the variability of a sample estimator that would be obtained from all possible samples of a given design and size. Standard errors are used as a measure of the precision expected from a particular sample. If all possible samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.96 standard errors below to 1.96 standard errors above a mean or proportion would include the true population parameter in about 95 percent of the samples. In general, for large sample sizes (n greater than or equal to 30) and for estimates of the mean or the proportion, the intervals described above provide a 95 percent confidence interval. If sample sizes are too small, or if the parameters being estimated are not means or proportions, then these intervals may not correspond to the 95 percent confidence level.

---

[12] The item nonresponse rate is defined as the ratio of the total number of nonresponses to the total number of individuals eligible to respond to a questionnaire item. The mean item nonresponse rates reported here are the unweighted means of the item nonresponse rates for all items on the questionnaires. For a full description of item nonresponse, see the forthcoming *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report.*

[13] For more information on imputation of missing data in sample surveys, see Kalton, Graham and Daniel Kasprzyk, "Imputing for Missing Survey Responses." Paper presented at 1982 Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association; Kalton, Graham and Daniel Kasprzyk, "The Treatment of Missing Survey Data," *Survey Methodology 12 (1)* (June, 1986), pp. 1-16.

The standard errors may be used to calculate confidence intervals around each estimate and to compare two or more estimates to determine if the observed differences are statistically significant. For example, table 2.3 in this report shows that an estimated 10.1 percent of full-time instructional faculty and staff were employed in public doctoral institutions in 1992. The standard error of that estimate is .20 percent (table T2.3). The 95 percent confidence interval for the statistic extends from 9.7 [10.1 - (1.96 times .20)] to 10.5 [10.1 + (1.96 times .20)] or from 9.7 to 10.5 percent. Standard errors for all estimates presented in this report's tables were computed using a technique known as Taylor series approximation. A computer program, SUDAAN,[14] was used to calculate the standard errors.

Comparisons noted in this report are significant at the .05 level. The significance of the difference between the overall mean (i.e., the mean of the entire population) and a subgroup mean (e.g., between the mean salary of all faculty in all institutions and the mean salary of all faculty in public doctoral institutions) was tested using a t-test in which the standard error of the difference was adjusted for the covariance between the subgroup and the total group. The exact formula for the appropriate t-test is:

$$t = \frac{\overline{X}_S - \overline{X}_T}{\sqrt{se_S^2 + se_T^2 - 2(p)\,se_S^2}}$$

where $\overline{X}_T$ and se_T are the mean and standard error for the total group, $\overline{X}_S$ and se_S are the mean and standard error for the subgroup, and *p* is the proportion of the total group contained in the subgroup.

When multiple pairwise comparisons were made, the acceptable minimum significance level was decreased by means of the Bonferroni adjustment.[15] This adjustment takes into account the increased likelihood, when making multiple comparisons, of finding significant pairwise differences simply by chance. With this adjustment, the significance level being used for each comparison (.05) is divided by the total number of comparisons being made.

Sample estimates also are subject to bias from nonsampling errors. It is more difficult to measure the magnitude of these errors. They can arise for a variety of reasons: nonresponse, undercoverage, differences in the respondent's interpretation of the meaning of questions, memory effects, misrecording of responses, incorrect editing, coding, and data entry, time effects, or errors in data processing. For example, undercoverage (in which institutions did not provide a complete enumeration of eligible faculty) and listing of ineligible faculty necessitated the "best estimates" correction to the NSOPF-93 faculty population estimates. For a more detailed discussion of the undercoverage problem, refer to the forthcoming *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report*. Whereas general sampling theory can be used, in part, to determine how to estimate the sampling variability of a statistic, nonsampling errors are not easy to measure. Measurement of nonsampling errors usually requires the incorporation of a methodological experiment into the survey or the use of external data to assess and verify survey results.

---

[14] Shah, Babubhai V., Beth G. Barnwell and Gayle S. Bieler, *SUDAAN User's Manual Release 6.4*. (Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute), 1995.

[15] For an explanation of the Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons, see Miller, Rupert G., *Simultaneous Statistical Inference* (New York: McGraw Hill Co.), 1981 or Dunn, Olive Jean, "Multiple Comparisons Among Means," *Journal of the American Statistical Association 56 (293),* (March, 1961), pp. 52-64.

To minimize the potential for nonsampling errors, the faculty and institution questionnaires (as well as the sample design, data collection, and data processing procedures) were field-tested with a national probability sample of 136 postsecondary institutions and 636 faculty members in 1992. To evaluate reliability, a subsample of faculty respondents were re-interviewed. An extensive item nonresponse analysis of the questionnaires also was conducted followed by additional evaluation of the instruments and survey procedures.[16] An item nonresponse analysis also was conducted for the full-scale surveys. See the forthcoming *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report* for a detailed description of the item nonresponse analysis.

In addition, for the full-scale surveys, a computer-based editing system was used to check data for range errors, logical inconsistencies, and erroneous skip patterns. For erroneous skip patterns, values were logically assigned on the basis of the presence or absence of responses within the skip pattern whenever feasible, given the responses. Missing or inconsistent critical items were retrieved. Some small inconsistencies between different data elements remained in the data files. In these situations, it was impossible to resolve the ambiguity as reported by the respondent. All data were keyed with 100 percent verification of a randomly selected subsample of 10 percent of all questionnaires received.

Calculating Estimates for Institutions Selected with Certainty

All 168 institutions in the certainty stratum were selected into the sample, and 144 of them responded to the institution questionnaire. Thus, aside from a small nonresponse variance, the variability associated with this stratum is essentially zero. Therefore, we note two cautions about the estimates of sampling variability presented in this report. First, if a comparison is to be made between the class of institutions in the certainty stratum and other classes of institutions, then (as an approximation) we recommend either that the variance of the estimator for the certainty stratum be set equal to zero, or that a without-replacement type variance formula be used for the certainty stratum with an appropriate finite population correction factor to account for random nonresponse variance. The former recommendation is equivalent to setting the variance of the estimated difference equal to the variance of the estimator for the noncertainty class.

Second, if analysis calls for certainty and noncertainty institutions to be combined, then appropriate standard errors should be calculated. For example, in most tables in this report, noncertainty institutions are divided into seven (out of nine) modified Carnegie strata, and institutions selected with certainty are divided into three strata: "Public Research," "Private Research," and "Public Doctoral."[17] The two research strata include *only* certainty institutions, and thus any estimators of variance for these strata should follow the recommendations presented above. Standard errors must be calculated for estimators for the public doctoral stratum, however, because it includes both certainty and noncertainty institutions (i.e. medical institutions).

---

[16] A complete description of the field test design and results can be found in Abraham, Sameer Y., *et al.*, *1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Field Test Report* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics [NCES:93-390]), February 1994.

Even in the case of the 14 noncertainty strata, many of the sampling fractions are important. Thus, we recommend that a without-replacement type variance formula — incorporating appropriate finite population correction factors — be used for these strata also. Specialized computer programs, such as SUDAAN, PC CARP, and CENVAR[18] are often used to estimate variances for complex sample designs, such as the NSOPF-93 design. The variances contained in this report were produced using SUDAAN's without replacement design.

Replicate Weights

Thirty-two replicate weights are provided on the data files for users who prefer another method of variance estimation. On the institution file, these weights implement the balanced half-sample (BHS) method of variance estimation,[19] and they have been created to handle the certainty stratum and to incorporate finite population correction factors for each of the 14 noncertainty strata. Two widely available software packages, WesVarPC®,[20] and PC CARP,[21] have capabilities to use replicate weights to estimate variances.

Analysts should be cautious about use of BHS estimated variances that relate to one stratum or to a group of two or three strata. Such variance estimates may be based upon far fewer than 32 replicates, and thus the variance of the variance estimator may be large.

A Note About Estimates Based Upon Small Samples

Analysts who use either the faculty file or the institution file should also be cautious about cross-classifying data so deeply that the resulting estimates are based upon a very small number of observations. Analysts should interpret the accuracy of NSOPF-93 statistics in light of estimated standard errors and of the number of observations used in the statistics.

---

[17] Note that the modified Carnegie stratum labeled "Public doctoral" is not equivalent to the set of "Public, Other Ph.D." institutions which form part of the certainty stratum in the sampling variable, since the "Public doctoral" stratum includes medical institutions.

[18] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *CENVAR IMPS Version 3.1* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census), 1995.

[19] For a discussion of the balanced half-sample (BHS) method of variance estimation, see Wolter, Kirk M., *Introduction to Variance Estimation* (New York: Springer-Verlag), 1985, pp. 110-152.

[20] Westat, Inc., *A User's Guide to WesVarPC®, Version 2.0* (Rockville, Md.: Westat, Inc.), 1996.

[21] Fuller, Wayne C., *et al., PC CARP IV.* (Ames, Iowa: Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State University), 1986.

Standard Error Tables

The following standard error tables correspond to the tables presented in the body of this report.

Table T2.1 — Standard errors of percentage distribution of higher education institutions and faculty and instructional staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Higher education institutions	Faculty and instructional staff
	Standard error	Standard error
	Number	Number
	72.8	34,980.3
	Percent	Percent
All institutions[1]	2.3	3.4
Public research	—	—
Private research	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.0	0.3
Private doctoral[2]	0.3	0.6
Public comprehensive	0.5	0.5
Private comprehensive	0.5	0.4
Private liberal arts	1.3	0.2
Public 2-year	1.3	1.1
Other[3]	1.4	3.0

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T2.2 — Standard errors of percentage distribution of full- and part-time higher education faculty and instructional staff, by instructional status (i.e., instructional or non-instructional), by permanent or temporary status: Fall 1992

Status	Faculty and instructional staff	
	Number	**Percent**
Total	34,980.3	0.0
Full-time	**24,781.7**	**2.4**
Instructional	21,748.1	2.1
Permanent	21,708.4	2.1
Temporary	1,129.8	0.1
Non-instructional	3,912.3	0.4
Permanent	3,418.9	0.3
Temporary	1,756.6	0.2
Part-time	**13,516.1**	**1.3**
Instructional	13,346.4	1.3
Non-instructional	1,165.3	0.1

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T2.3 — Standard errors of the percentage distribution of higher education faculty and instructional staff by employment status and type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Faculty and instructional staff	Instructional faculty and staff			Non-instructional faculty		
		Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
	34,980.3	31,945.7	21,748.1	13,346.4	4,530.1	3,912.3	1,165.3
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
All institutions[1]	3.4	3.4	4.0	3.3	4.8	5.2	6.2
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.6
Private doctoral[2]	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.4
Public comprehensive	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.8	1.5	3.9
Private comprehensive	0.4	0.4	0.3	1.0	1.7	1.7	1.9
Private liberal arts	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.9	1.0
Public 2-year	1.1	1.2	0.7	2.2	2.4	2.1	4.2
Other[3]	3.0	3.0	3.9	2.0	3.2	3.9	0.4

— This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T3.1 — **Standard errors of net percentage change between the fall of 1991 and the fall of 1992 in the number of permanent full-time higher education faculty and instructional staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty
	Percent change between 1991 and 1992	Percent change between 1991 and 1992
	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	0.2	0.7
Public research	—	—
Private research	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.4	0.4
Private doctoral[2]	0.4	2.0
Public comprehensive	0.4	1.3
Private comprehensive	0.9	2.2
Private liberal arts	0.5	3.2
Public 2-year	0.4	1.6
Other[3]	0.6	3.5

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty "Institution Survey."

Table T3.2 — Standard errors of the percentage of permanent full-time higher education faculty and instructional staff who left institutions of higher education between 1991 and 1992, by reason for leaving and type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institutions	Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff: 1991	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff			
		Percent who left	Of those who left, percentage distribution of reason for departure		
			Retirement	Downsizing	Other
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	21,711.9	0.1	0.9	0.5	0.9
Public research	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	1,197.7	0.5	1.8	0.4	2.0
Private doctoral[2]	3,604.9	0.5	2.4	0.5	2.6
Public comprehensive	2,748.6	0.3	2.5	0.6	2.4
Private comprehensive	1,530.6	0.6	3.9	1.0	3.7
Private liberal arts	1,634.8	0.8	3.9	3.5	4.1
Public 2-year	3,881.9	0.3	2.7	1.4	2.6
Other[3]	20,751.8	0.5	2.8	3.8	3.2

Type and control of institutions	Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty: 1991	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty			
		Percent who left	Of those who left, percentage distribution of reason for departure		
			Retirement	Downsizing	Other
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[4]	3,079.0	0.3	1.7	0.3	1.7
Public research	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	339.7	0.3	1.2	0.1	1.2
Private doctoral[2]	221.7	0.7	5.4	0.7	5.5
Public comprehensive	836.8	0.8	3.5	1.3	3.7
Private comprehensive	596.4	0.7	7.0	0.0	7.0
Private liberal arts	672.1	1.3	13.9	0.0	13.9
Public 2-year	922.2	0.7	4.4	0.8	4.5
Other[3]	2,638.0	1.7	4.4	0.0	4.4

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the ***Technical Notes*** concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T3.3 — Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992 and the percentage distribution of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff accepting early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff	
	Higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992	Faculty who took early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992
	Standard error	Standard error
	Number	Number
	72.9	2,236.7
	Percent	Percent
All institutions[1]	1.9	8.5
Public research	—	—
Private research	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	2.0	0.3
Private doctoral[2]	7.5	0.3
Public comprehensive	3.8	2.0
Private comprehensive	6.0	0.8
Private liberal arts	5.9	2.0
Public 2-year	3.1	4.2
Other[3]	4.0	6.8

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	
	Higher education institutions offering early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992	Faculty who took early or phased retirement between 1987 and 1992
	Standard error	Standard error
	Number	Number
	80.6	253.8
	Percent	Percent
All institutions[4]	2.1	6.3
Public research	—	—
Private research	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	1.9	0.1
Private doctoral[2]	3.4	0.1
Public comprehensive	3.8	4.0
Private comprehensive	5.0	2.4
Private liberal arts	4.1	3.1
Public 2-year	4.1	3.0
Other[3]	4.3	0.7

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T4.1 — Standard errors of the percentage of institutions with tenure systems for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and percentage with tenure, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff			
		Percent of institutions with tenure systems	Percent of faculty tenured in 1992	Percent of faculty on tenure track in 1992	Percent of faculty not on tenure track or no tenure system in 1992
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	78.9	2.2	0.7	0.5	0.9
Public research	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.5	1.2
Private doctoral[2]	6.6	3.5	3.6	3.0	4.6
Public comprehensive	11.7	0.0	1.1	0.8	0.8
Private comprehensive	17.2	5.1	2.5	1.9	3.4
Private liberal arts	37.8	6.0	2.9	2.3	3.9
Public 2-year	41.3	3.1	2.3	1.0	2.7
Other[3]	51.2	7.2	5.6	1.4	6.2

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty			
		Percent of institutions with tenure systems	Percent of faculty tenured in 1992	Percent of faculty on tenure track in 1992	Percent of faculty not on tenure track or no tenure system in 1992
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[4]	86.2	2.8	1.1	0.6	1.3
Public research	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	2.2	3.1	1.6	0.5	2.0
Private doctoral[2]	5.1	4.4	2.8	0.4	2.9
Public comprehensive	10.9	3.5	3.4	1.9	4.7
Private comprehensive	17.8	7.2	5.2	2.9	7.6
Private liberal arts	43.8	8.8	3.4	6.7	7.8
Public 2-year	35.6	4.1	4.1	1.3	4.9
Other[3]	61.5	8.0	6.5	0.8	7.1

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T4.2 — Standard errors of the percentage of permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff considered for tenure and of those considered, the percentage who were granted tenure during the 1992-93 academic year, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Percent of 1992 permanent full-time tenure track instructional faculty and staff considered for tenure	Percent of 1992 permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff considered for tenure who were granted tenure
All institutions[1]	0.9	2.0
Public research	—	—
Private research	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.6	0.8
Private doctoral[2]	2.1	7.3
Public comprehensive	2.1	5.5
Private comprehensive	7.0	5.0
Private liberal arts	2.9	11.5
Public 2-year	2.8	4.1
Other[3]	5.6	5.7

Type and control of institution	Percent of 1992 permanent full-time tenure track non-instructional faculty considered for tenure	Percent of 1992 permanent full-time non-instructional faculty considered for tenure who were granted tenure
All institutions[4]	1.2	2.5
Public research	—	—
Private research	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.7	1.7
Private doctoral[2]	4.5	0.0
Public comprehensive	2.2	3.6
Private comprehensive	3.0	7.9
Private liberal arts	0.7	0.0
Public 2-year	3.1	4.9
Other[3]	3.4	0.0

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T4.3 — Standard errors of the percentage of institutions that limit time on tenure track for permanent full-time faculty and instructional staff and percentage distribution of the maximum number of years on a tenure track without tenure, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff						
	Number of institutions with tenure systems	Percent of institutions that limit time on tenure track	Percent of institutions with time limits of:				
			<5 years	5 years	6 years	7 years	>7 years
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	78.3	2.1	1.7	1.4	2.3	2.4	1.4
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	1.4	0.9	0.0	2.6	2.6	1.0
Private doctoral[2]	6.6	5.9	1.5	0.6	5.5	7.2	3.7
Public comprehensive	11.7	3.6	0.5	2.4	3.3	3.3	0.9
Private comprehensive	16.4	5.7	3.0	3.0	6.5	6.9	1.7
Private liberal arts	38.2	6.5	0.0	4.1	8.1	8.2	0.0
Public 2-year	37.9	2.5	3.8	2.2	2.8	3.0	0.7
Other[3]	52.8	9.9	7.3	7.5	11.8	11.7	11.4

Type and control of institution	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty						
	Number of institutions with tenure systems	Percent of institutions that limit time on tenure track	Percent of institutions with time limits of:				
			<5 years	5 years	6 years	7 years	>7 years
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[4]	60.2	3.6	3.2	1.5	3.2	4.0	3.2
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	2.3	3.6	0.0	0.2	4.7	4.6	0.0
Private doctoral[2]	2.2	7.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	11.8	12.5
Public comprehensive	11.5	3.6	2.9	3.7	4.8	4.8	2.0
Private comprehensive	14.6	8.1	0.0	7.5	11.4	11.1	3.7
Private liberal arts	33.8	14.2	17.1	0.0	21.6	16.8	0.0
Public 2-year	28.1	4.7	4.8	2.3	2.6	4.5	0.0
Other[3]	36.7	17.4	3.8	0.0	0.0	27.2	26.9

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T4.4 — Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions that took specific actions related to tenure during the past five years, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with tenure systems	Permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff		
		Percent of institutions that have:		
		Replaced tenured with fixed-term positions	Raised tenure standards	Taken other actions
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	75.5	1.7	2.0	1.2
Public research	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	1.6	1.4	0.9
Private doctoral[2]	10.0	5.3	9.5	1.6
Public comprehensive	14.8	3.9	3.9	1.9
Private comprehensive	16.4	5.4	4.8	5.4
Private liberal arts	38.8	4.4	4.3	1.9
Public 2-year	38.4	2.7	3.3	1.8
Other[3]	47.0	6.4	9.2	6.1

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with tenure systems	Permanent full-time non-instructional faculty		
		Percent of institutions that have:		
		Replaced tenured with fixed-term positions	Raised tenure standards	Taken other actions
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	53.8	1.1	2.3	1.3
Public research	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	1.6	1.6	0.6	0.5
Private doctoral[2]	1.9	0.0	4.6	0.0
Public comprehensive	11.3	2.3	3.6	2.6
Private comprehensive	14.6	5.8	4.3	8.4
Private liberal arts	33.8	4.6	7.1	0.0
Public 2-year	28.3	1.3	4.5	1.9
Other[3]	24.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

[4] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.1 — **Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff	Percent of institutions offering specified retirement plans					
		Any retirement plan	TIAA/ CREF	Other 403B	State plan	401K or 401B	Other retirement
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	78.9	1.2	2.1	2.2	1.6	1.7	2.1
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	0.0	1.4	2.1	1.7	1.8	2.2
Private doctoral[2]	6.6	0.0	4.8	5.6	1.5	2.2	5.4
Public comprehensive	11.7	0.0	2.2	3.7	2.4	2.5	3.3
Private comprehensive	17.2	0.0	2.3	6.1	1.4	5.2	4.6
Private liberal arts	37.8	2.4	4.6	6.5	1.8	5.2	6.3
Public 2-year	41.3	0.2	3.1	3.0	2.3	2.0	2.5
Other[3]	51.2	4.9	7.1	6.3	4.9	5.0	6.7

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.2 — **Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	Percent of institutions offering specified retirement plans					
		Any retirement plan	TIAA/ CREF	Other 403B	State plan	401K or 401B	Other retirement
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	80.6	1.9	2.6	3.1	2.3	2.2	2.6
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	1.8	0.0	0.3	2.0	1.3	1.7	1.7
Private doctoral[2]	6.7	0.0	9.1	7.5	0.0	1.3	8.1
Public comprehensive	10.8	0.0	2.6	3.8	3.0	2.9	3.7
Private comprehensive	17.8	0.0	3.4	7.0	0.0	7.2	4.9
Private liberal arts	43.5	2.7	7.3	8.9	1.3	8.0	8.0
Public 2-year	35.8	0.3	3.7	3.9	3.3	2.4	3.6
Other[3]	53.6	7.9	8.5	9.8	6.3	5.8	8.0

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.3 — Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified retirement plans to any part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with part-time instructional faculty/staff	Percent of institutions offering specified retirement plans					
		Any retirement plan	TIAA/ CREF	Other 403B	State plan	401K or 401B	Other retirement
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[2]	78.8	2.2	1.8	1.4	1.3	0.8	1.3
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[3]	0.5	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.4	1.8
Private doctoral[3]	6.7	6.3	6.5	6.5	1.8	1.0	2.5
Public comprehensive	11.8	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.5	1.6	2.4
Private comprehensive	17.5	5.2	4.5	3.9	0.0	3.0	1.5
Private liberal arts	37.8	6.3	6.3	4.5	0.0	3.4	1.6
Public 2-year	41.2	3.1	2.4	1.8	3.0	1.2	2.0
Other[4]	51.0	6.3	4.8	3.5	2.7	1.2	4.5

[1] This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[2] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with part-time instructional faculty and staff that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[3] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[4] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.4 — **Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any permanent full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions	78.9	2.2	0.5	2.1	1.6	1.3	2.0	1.9	1.8
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	2.3	0.0	1.1	0.8	.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Private doctoral[2]	6.6	5.9	0.0	1.9	3.3	6.7	3.3	2.6	5.4
Public comprehensive	11.7	3.6	0.7	2.2	1.7	0.7	3.6	3.6	3.5
Private comprehensive	17.2	5.9	0.0	4.4	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	4.4
Private liberal arts	37.8	6.5	0.0	6.2	3.1	3.7	3.7	1.1	4.8
Public 2-year	41.3	3.1	0.2	1.9	1.9	0.8	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other[3]	51.2	6.7	2.3	7.2	6.0	5.0	7.2	7.1	4.8

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions	78.9	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.1
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	0.9	1.9	2.1	1.5	1.8	1.8	2.4
Private doctoral[2]	6.6	2.7	2.2	6.2	4.0	6.0	5.8	5.6
Public comprehensive	11.7	1.9	2.2	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.0
Private comprehensive	17.2	1.8	4.1	6.0	3.0	5.5	6.2	4.4
Private liberal arts	37.8	6.0	6.1	6.2	4.5	6.6	6.7	6.6
Public 2-year	41.3	1.4	1.6	3.1	2.2	3.1	2.7	2.8
Other[3]	51.2	7.2	6.3	7.1	7.1	7.2	7.1	6.1

This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.5 — Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	78.9	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.4
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.1	2.4
Private doctoral[2]	6.7	3.7	6.3	6.3	6.4	5.2	6.4	6.5	2.6
Public comprehensive	11.9	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	2.8	2.6	3.3
Private comprehensive	17.5	4.2	6.1	5.4	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.5	2.8
Private liberal arts	40.0	4.5	6.8	5.6	6.4	6.2	5.8	5.8	4.4
Public 2-year	41.6	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.8
Other[3]	49.0	4.4	3.5	4.8	4.7	4.6	3.7	3.7	2.3

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transpor- tation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	78.9	0.6	1.2	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.3
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	0.8	1.7	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.0
Private doctoral[2]	6.7	1.4	1.0	4.1	4.0	3.5	2.2	2.0
Public comprehensive	11.9	0.9	1.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.5	2.4
Private comprehensive	17.5	1.6	3.9	5.6	5.3	4.8	2.3	2.8
Private liberal arts	40.0	2.6	4.0	6.4	5.4	4.0	4.2	3.3
Public 2-year	41.6	0.6	0.8	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.3
Other[3]	49.0	0.8	3.5	4.3	3.4	3.4	1.6	3.7

— This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with temporary full-time instructional faculty and staff that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.6 — **Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992**

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	80.6	2.7	1.0	2.8	2.4	1.8	2.8	2.7	2.2
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	1.8	2.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	1.9	2.0	2.0
Private doctoral[2]	6.7	6.6	0.0	2.0	6.1	0.0	4.6	4.4	7.3
Public comprehensive	10.8	3.9	0.6	2.6	2.3	1.0	3.7	3.7	3.9
Private comprehensive	17.8	6.9	0.0	5.3	0.0	1.4	1.9	0.0	5.4
Private liberal arts	43.5	8.6	0.0	8.4	5.5	3.7	2.6	0.0	4.5
Public 2-year	35.8	4.1	0.3	2.6	2.7	1.2	3.5	3.8	3.9
Other[3]	53.6	7.4	4.5	9.0	8.5	7.4	10.3	9.9	5.6

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	80.6	2.5	2.7	3.1	2.6	2.8	3.1	2.6
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	1.8	1.3	1.9	1.7	0.4	0.6	1.3	1.7
Private doctoral[2]	6.7	2.6	3.5	7.1	7.7	6.1	7.0	7.8
Public comprehensive	10.8	2.2	2.6	3.1	2.4	3.6	2.4	3.6
Private comprehensive	17.8	2.2	5.4	7.2	4.3	6.8	7.2	6.0
Private liberal arts	43.5	7.8	8.0	8.9	7.8	8.9	8.9	9.0
Public 2-year	35.8	1.1	1.5	4.1	3.2	3.8	3.7	3.0
Other[3]	53.6	8.6	10.0	9.7	8.7	8.1	9.5	6.7

— This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with permanent full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.7 — Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any temporary full-time non-instructional faculty, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with temporary full-time non-instructional faculty	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	80.9	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.4	1.7
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.1	0.7	1.3	1.7
Private doctoral[2]	6.8	2.8	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.2	1.6
Public comprehensive	11.0	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9	2.5	2.4	3.4
Private comprehensive	18.2	3.4	7.1	7.0	6.5	6.4	6.3	6.3	3.1
Private liberal arts	43.7	5.6	8.8	8.1	7.3	7.7	7.8	7.8	5.1
Public 2-year	35.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.4
Other[3]	53.6	8.4	7.6	7.9	7.6	7.6	5.9	5.9	3.3

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with temporary full-time non-instructional faculty	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	80.9	1.0	2.1	2.5	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.6
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	1.8	0.1	1.6	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.4	0.6
Private doctoral[2]	6.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	3.2	2.8	1.6	1.1
Public comprehensive	11.0	0.9	2.0	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.5	2.3
Private comprehensive	18.2	0.9	1.9	5.7	6.1	5.8	2.2	3.3
Private liberal arts	43.7	5.7	7.5	6.6	6.0	4.5	4.7	1.9
Public 2-year	35.9	1.2	1.2	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.7	1.6
Other[3]	53.6	1.1	6.8	7.2	4.8	4.7	5.2	6.3

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with temporary full-time non-instructional faculty that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.8 — Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions offering specified benefits to any part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with any part-time instructional faculty/staff	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits							
		Wellness program or health promotion	Medical insurance or medical care	Dental insurance or dental care	Disability insurance program	Life insurance	Tuition remission/ grants for spouse	Tuition remission/ grants for children	Child care
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	78.8	1.8	2.2	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.7	1.6	1.3
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	2.5	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.4
Private doctoral[2]	6.7	3.4	6.4	6.6	6.6	3.5	6.5	6.6	3.1
Public comprehensive	11.8	3.1	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.3	2.2	3.0
Private comprehensive	17.5	3.0	5.4	4.8	2.7	3.8	3.6	3.4	2.9
Private liberal arts	37.8	6.0	6.4	5.8	5.7	5.6	5.4	5.3	3.5
Public 2-year	41.2	2.6	3.0	2.4	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.1
Other[3]	51.0	5.1	6.5	5.8	5.4	6.3	5.2	4.8	3.4

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with any part-time instructional faculty/staff	Percent of institutions offering specified benefits *(continued)*						
		Housing/ mortgage	Meals	Transportation/ parking	Maternity leave	Paternity leave	Medical insurance for retirees	"Cafeteria-style"
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	78.8	0.9	1.6	2.1	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	0.8	1.9	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0
Private doctoral[2]	6.7	1.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	3.1	6.8	2.1
Public comprehensive	11.8	1.0	1.8	3.5	3.1	3.0	2.8	1.7
Private comprehensive	17.5	0.6	3.6	5.5	3.0	3.5	3.3	1.5
Private liberal arts	37.8	2.6	5.2	6.7	5.6	5.6	4.8	4.6
Public 2-year	41.6	0.3	0.5	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.2	1.9
Other[3]	51.0	3.3	5.4	6.3	5.5	3.4	4.1	4.8

This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with part-time instructional faculty and staff that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

Table T5.9 — Standard errors of the percentage of higher education institutions with criteria for benefit eligibility for part-time instructional faculty and staff, by type and control of institution: Fall 1992

Type and control of institution	Number of institutions with part-time instructional faculty/staff	Number of institutions with any criteria	Minimum hours per week			Minimum length of employment		
			Percent of institutions	Average hours	Percent of faculty meeting minimum	Percent of institutions	Percent more than one academic year	Percent of faculty meeting minimum
	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error	Standard error
All institutions[1]	78.8	70.1	2.0	0.8	2.2	1.3	0.7	2.9
Public research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Private research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Public doctoral[2]	0.5	2.1	2.5	0.5	1.8	2.4	1.7	2.6
Private doctoral[2]	6.7	6.5	6.5	1.2	6.7	6.6	6.7	6.0
Public comprehensive	11.8	10.7	3.3	0.9	2.5	3.1	2.0	3.6
Private comprehensive	17.5	14.6	5.0	1.6	3.9	4.6	3.9	6.9
Private liberal arts	37.8	31.4	5.7	1.7	6.9	4.0	2.7	9.5
Public 2-year	41.2	31.6	2.6	1.2	3.2	2.1	1.2	5.2
Other[3]	51.0	50.6	6.1	3.8	8.9	3.4	0.0	19.9

—This estimate represents the population of institutions in this stratum. Therefore, there is no standard error associated with it. For more information on this issue, see the *Technical Notes* concerning institutions selected with certainty.

[1] All accredited, nonproprietary U.S. postsecondary institutions with part-time instructional faculty and staff that grant a 2-year (A.A.) or higher degree and whose accreditation at the higher education level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey."

APPENDIX B

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

OMB: No. 1850-0665
Expiration Date: 3/94

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

National Center for Education Statistics

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

All information on this form will be kept confidential and will be used only in statistical summaries. All information that would permit identification of individuals will be removed from survey files.

Co-sponsored by: National Science Foundation
National Endowment for the Humanities

Contractor: National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
Mailing Address:
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615
Toll-Free Number: 1-800-733-NORC

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY (NSOPF) INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

General Instructions

Obtaining counts of different kinds of faculty/staff is an important part of NSOPF-93. The institution questionnaire seeks information about full- and part-time instructional faculty and other instructional personnel, as well as non-instructional faculty in 2- and 4-year (and above) higher education institutions of all types and sizes. Section I pertains to **full-time instructional faculty/staff**, Section II pertains to **full-time non-instructional faculty**, and Section III pertains to **part-time instructional faculty/staff**. For more information on who to include or exclude in each of the sections of this questionnaire, please refer to the glossary below and/or the introduction at each section. Since we are asking about full- and part-time, and permanent and temporary faculty/staff as defined by your institution, please write in those definitions in the space provided in the glossary.

Most questions ask you to fill in information; write in the number in the space provided. Other questions ask you to circle a number to indicate your response; circle the number in front of the response, and not the response itself. Please read each question carefully and follow all instructions. Some of the questions may not appear to fit your institution precisely; if you have a response other than those listed for a particular question, write in that response.

Many questions ask about the 1992 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on **October 15, 1992**. If your institution has multiple campuses, answer only for the campus named in the label on the back of the questionnaire.

Please keep track of who fills out this questionnaire and fill in this information on page 20. Mailing instructions for the completed questionnaire are also on page 20.

If you have any questions on how to proceed if your institution has both lay faculty and those assigned by a religious order, or if you have other questions, please call NORC toll-free at 1-800-733-NORC.

Glossary

Instructional faculty/staff--All institutional staff (faculty and non-faculty) whose major regular assignment at this institution (more than 50%) is instruction. This corresponds to the IPEDS definition. Individuals do not need to have a dedicated instructional assignment to be included in this category. Be sure to include (1) administrators whose major responsibility is instruction; (2) individuals with major instructional assignments who have temporary, adjunct, acting, or visiting status; (3) individuals whose major regular assignment is instruction but who have been granted release time for other institutional activities; and (4) individuals whose major regular assignment is instruction but who are on sabbatical from your institution.

Please do not include: Graduate or undergraduate teaching assistants, postdoctoral appointees, temporary replacements for personnel on sabbatical leave, instructional personnel on leave without pay or teaching outside the U.S., military personnel who teach only ROTC courses, and instructional personnel supplied by independent contractors.

Non-instructional faculty--All institutional staff who have faculty status but would not be included as instructional faculty since their specific and major regular assignment is not instruction but may be for the purpose of conducting research, performing public service, or carrying out administrative functions of the institution.

ON THE NEXT PAGE, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITIONS OF FULL- AND PART-TIME AND PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY FACULTY/STAFF.

Full-time instructional faculty/staff *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Full-time non-instructional faculty *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Part-time instructional faculty/staff *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Part-time non-instructional faculty *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Permanent faculty/instructional staff *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Temporary faculty/instructional staff *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

PLEASE FILL OUT THE REST OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE USING YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITIONS OF FULL- AND PART-TIME AND PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY FACULTY/STAFF. PLEASE REMEMBER THAT THE 1992 FALL TERM IS THE PRIMARY REFERENCE PERIOD.

1. **During the 1992 Fall Term, how many of each of the following types of staff were employed by your institution? Include both permanent and temporary faculty/staff.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

____a. Full-time instructional faculty/staff

____b. Part-time instructional faculty/staff

____c. Full-time non-instructional faculty

____d. Part-time non-instructional faculty

GUIDE TO COMPLETING THE REST OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

IF YOUR INSTITUTION HAD ANY FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF, BEGIN WITH SECTION I ON THE NEXT PAGE. IF YOUR INSTITUTION DID NOT HAVE ANY FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF, SKIP TO SECTION II ON PAGE 10.

SECTION I: FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF

QUESTIONS 2-14 APPLY TO PERMANENT FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF (REFER TO THE GLOSSARY ON PAGE 1)

QUESTIONS 15-16 APPLY TO TEMPORARY FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF

QUESTIONS 17-19 APPLY TO ALL FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF

2. **Please provide the following information about changes in the number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff between the 1991 and 1992 Fall Terms.**
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")

_____ a. Total permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff during 1992 Fall Term
(IF ALL FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF AT YOUR INSTITUTION ARE PERMANENT, THIS NUMBER SHOULD EQUAL THE NUMBER REPORTED IN QUESTION 1a, ON PAGE 3)

_____ b. Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff at the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term who were hired since the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term

_____ c. Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who retired between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ d. Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who left because of downsizing between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ e. Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who left for other reasons between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ f. Total permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff during 1991 Fall Term

3. **How many permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff did your institution seek to hire for the 1992 Fall Term?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff

4. **Were any permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff positions not filled for the 1992 Fall Term due to fiscal constraints?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ⟶ (A.) _____ Number of unfilled positions *(WRITE IN A NUMBER)*
2. No

5. **Does your institution have a tenure system for full-time instructional faculty/staff?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes (CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 6 ON THE NEXT PAGE)
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 11 ON PAGE 6)

6. **During the 1992 and 1991 Fall Terms, how many tenured and tenure-track full-time instructional faculty/staff did your institution have?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

______ a. Tenured, 1992 Fall Term

______ b. Tenure-track, 1992 Fall Term

______ c. Tenured, 1991 Fall Term

______ d. Tenure-track, 1991 Fall Term

7. **Of those tenured full-time instructional faculty/staff who left your institution between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term, how many left for each of the following reasons?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

______ a. Retirement

______ b. Downsizing

______ c. For other reasons

8. **During the 1992-93 academic year (i.e., Fall 1992 through Spring 1993), how many full-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution were considered for tenure, and how many were granted tenure?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

______ a. Number of full-time instructional faculty/staff considered for tenure

______ b. Number of full-time instructional faculty/staff granted tenure

9. **Fill in the following information about the maximum number of years full-time instructional faculty/staff can be on a tenure track.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE)*

______ Yrs a. Maximum number of years full-time instructional faculty/staff can be on a tenure track and not receive tenure *(IF NO MAXIMUM, WRITE IN "0")*

______ Yrs b. If maximum number of years has changed during past 5 years, write in previous maximum *(IF NO CHANGE, WRITE IN "0")*

10. **During the past five years, has your institution done any of the following?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ACTION)*

Yes	No		
1	2	a.	Replaced some tenured or tenure-track full-time instructional faculty with faculty on fixed-term contracts
1	2	b.	Made the standards more stringent for granting tenure to full-time instructional faculty/staff
1	2	c.	Taken any other actions designed to lower the percent of tenured full-time instructional faculty/staff *(DESCRIBE ANY ACTIONS TAKEN)*

____

____

11. **During the past five years, has your institution offered early or phased retirement to any permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ⟶ (A.) ____ Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who took advantage of this offer during the past five years *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

2. No

12. **Indicate if each of the retirement plans listed below is available to any permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution. If available, please indicate whether the plan is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.**

		(12A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. TIAA/CREF plan	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
b. Other 403B plan	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
c. State plan	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
d. 401K or 401B plan	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
e. Other retirement plan	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3

13. **Indicate which of the following employee benefits is available at your institution to any permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.**

		(13A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3

14. **What is the average percentage of salary that is contributed by your institution to the total benefits package for permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff?** *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ %

15. **Are any of the employee benefits listed in Question 13 available to temporary full-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER OR DK)*

1. Yes **(ANSWER QUESTION 16)**
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 17 ON THE NEXT PAGE)**

DK. Don't Know **(SKIP TO QUESTION 17 ON THE NEXT PAGE)**

16. **Indicate which of the following employee benefits is available to temporary full-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER A BENEFIT IS AVAILABLE, CIRCLE "DK")*

(16A)

			Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3

17. **What percentage of undergraduate instruction, as measured by total student credit hours taught, is carried by all full-time permanent and temporary instructional faculty/staff? Student credit hours are defined as the number of course credits or contact hours multiplied by the number of students enrolled.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. NONE
2. Less than 10%
3. 10-24%
4. 25-49%
5. 50-74%
6. 75-99%
7. 100%

18. **Are any of the following used in assessing the teaching performance of full-time (permanent or temporary) instructional faculty/staff at this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER OR "DK" ON EACH LINE)*

Yes	No	Don't Know		
1	2	DK	a.	Student evaluations
1	2	DK	b.	Student test scores
1	2	DK	c.	Student career placement
1	2	DK	d.	Other measures of student performance
1	2	DK	e.	Department/division chair evaluations
1	2	DK	f.	Dean evaluations
1	2	DK	g.	Peer evaluations
1	2	DK	h.	Self-evaluations
1	2	DK	i.	Other *(DESCRIBE)* ______________________

19. **Are any of your full-time instructional faculty/staff legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining with this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ⟶ (A.) ____% (approximate) percent represented *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE)*
2. No

SECTION II: FULL-TIME NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

IF YOU INDICATED YOUR INSTITUTION HAD NO FULL-TIME NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (AT QUESTION 1c), PLEASE SKIP TO SECTION III, PAGE 15. OTHERWISE, CONTINUE WITH SECTION II.

QUESTIONS 20-30 APPLY TO PERMANENT FULL-TIME NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (REFER TO THE GLOSSARY ON PAGE 1). PLEASE WRITE IN BELOW EXAMPLES OF SOME OF THE TITLES OR POSITIONS HELD BY NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT YOUR INSTITUTION (e.g., RESEARCH SCIENTIST, COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR, VICE-PRESIDENT, ETC.).

____

____

____

QUESTIONS 31-33 APPLY TO TEMPORARY FULL-TIME NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY.

20. **Please provide the following information about changes in the number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty between the 1991 and 1992 Fall Terms.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0." IF YOU DON'T KNOW, WRITE IN "DK")*

_____ a. Total permanent full-time non-instructional faculty during 1992 Fall Term

_____ b. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty at the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term who were hired since the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term

_____ c. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who retired between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ d. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who left because of downsizing between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ e. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who left for other reasons between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ f. Total permanent full-time non-instructional faculty during 1991 Fall Term

21. **Does your institution have a tenure system for full-time non-instructional faculty?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes

2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 27 ON PAGE 12)

22. **During the 1992 and 1991 Fall Terms, how many tenured and tenure-track full-time non-instructional faculty did your institution have?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Tenured, 1992 Fall Term

_____ b. Tenure-track, 1992 Fall Term

_____ c. Tenured, 1991 Fall Term

_____ d. Tenure-track, 1991 Fall Term

23. **Of those tenured non-instructional faculty who left your institution between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term, how many left for each of the following reasons?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Retirement

_____ b. Downsizing

_____ c. For other reasons

24. **During the 1992-93 academic year (i.e., Fall 1992 through Spring 1993), how many full-time non-instructional faculty at your institution were considered for tenure, and how many were granted tenure?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty considered for tenure

_____ b. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty granted tenure

25. **Fill in the following information about the maximum number of years full-time non-instructional faculty can be on a tenure track.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE)*

_____ Yrs a. Maximum number of years full-time non-instructional faculty staff can be on a tenure track and not receive tenure *(IF NO MAXIMUM, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ Yrs b. If maximum number of years has changed during past 5 years, write in previous maximum *(IF NO CHANGE, WRITE IN "0")*

26. **During the past five years, has your institution done any of the following?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ACTION)*

Yes	No		
1	2	a.	Replaced some tenured or tenure-track full-time non-instructional faculty positions with faculty on fixed-term contracts
1	2	b.	Made the standards more stringent for granting tenure to full-time non-instructional faculty
1	2	c.	Taken any other actions designed to lower the percent of tenured full-time non-instructional faculty *(DESCRIBE ANY ACTIONS TAKEN)*

____

____

27. **During the past five years, has your institution offered early or phased retirement to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ——→ (A.) ____ Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who took advantage of this offer during the past five years *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

2. No

28. **Indicate if each of the retirement plans listed below is available to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty at your institution. If available, please indicate whether the plan is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.**

		(28A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. TIAA/CREF plan	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
b. Other 403B plan	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
c. State plan	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
d. 401K or 401B plan	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
e. Other retirement plan	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3

29. **Indicate which of the following employee benefits is available at your institution to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.**

		(29A) Fully Subsidized	Partially Subsidized	Not Subsidized
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No	1	2	3

30. **What is the average percentage of salary that is contributed by your institution to the total benefits package for permanent full-time non-instructional faculty?** *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ %

31. **Are any of the employee benefits listed in Question 29 available to temporary full-time non-instructional faculty at your institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER OR DK)*

1. Yes **(ANSWER QUESTION 32)**
2. No **(SKIP TO SECTION III ON PAGE 15)**

DK. Don't Know **(SKIP TO SECTION III ON PAGE 15)**

32. **Indicate which of these employee benefits is available to temporary full-time non-instructional faculty at your institution. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW IF A BENEFIT IS AVAILABLE, CIRCLE "DK")*

		(32A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3

33. **Are any of your full-time non-instructional faculty legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining with this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ⟶ (A.) _____ (approximate) percent represented *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE)*
2. No

SECTION III: PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF

IF YOU INDICATED THAT YOUR INSTITUTION HAD NO PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF (AT QUESTION 1b), PLEASE SKIP TO PAGE 20. OTHERWISE, CONTINUE WITH SECTION III.

34. **Are any retirement plans available to any part-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 36)**

35. **Indicate which of the retirement plans listed below is available to any part-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution. If available, please indicate whether the plan is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW IF A PLAN IS AVAILABLE, CIRCLE "DK")*

(35A)

			Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. TIAA/CREF plan	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
b. Other 403B plan	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
c. State plan	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
d. 401K or 401B plan	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3
e. Other retirement plan	1. Yes → 2. No	DK	1	2	3

36. **Are any employee benefits available to any part-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes **(CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 37 ON THE NEXT PAGE)**
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 41 ON PAGE 17)**

37. **Indicate which of the following employee benefits is available at your institution to __any__ part-time instructional faculty/staff. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW IF A BENEFIT IS AVAILABLE, CIRCLE "DK")*

		(37A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
p. Other	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3

38. **What is the average percentage of salary that is contributed by your institution to the total benefits package for part-time instructional faculty/staff?** *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ %

39. **Does your institution have any criteria that must be met in order for part-time instructional faculty/staff to be eligible for any benefits?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 41)

40. **Indicate which requirements must be met at your institution by part-time instructional faculty/staff to be eligible for any benefits.** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW IF A REQUIREMENT APPLIES, CIRCLE "DK")*

		(40A) **Description of Requirement**	(40B) **Percent of Part-time Instructional Faculty/Staff That Meet This Requirement**
a. Minimum number of hours employed per week at institution	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	_____ number of hours required per week	____%
b. Minimum length of time employed at institution	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	*(CIRCLE ONE)* 1. Less than one academic year 2. One academic year 3. More than one academic year	____%
c. Other requirement	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	*(DESCRIBE)* __________ __________________ __________________	____%

41. **What percentage of undergraduate instruction, as measured by total student credit hours taught, is carried by part-time instructional faculty/staff? Student credit hours are defined as the number of course credits or contact hours multiplied by the number of students enrolled.** *(NOTE: THE PERCENTAGES YOU INDICATE HERE PLUS ANY PERCENTAGES YOU INDICATED AT QUESTION 17 ON PAGE 9 SHOULD NOT EXCEED 100%)*

1. NONE
2. Less than 10%
3. 10-24%
4. 25-49%
5. 50-74
6. 75-99%
7. 100%

42. Are any of the following used in assessing the teaching performance of part-time instructional faculty/staff at this institution? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER OR "DK" ON EACH LINE)*

Yes	No	Don't Know		
1	2	DK	a.	Student evaluations
1	2	DK	b.	Student test scores
1	2	DK	c.	Student career placement
1	2	DK	d.	Other measures of student performance
1	2	DK	e.	Department/division chair evaluations
1	2	DK	f.	Dean evaluations
1	2	DK	g.	Peer evaluations
1	2	DK	h.	Self-evaluations
1	2	DK	i.	Other *(DESCRIBE)* ____________________________

43. Are any of your part-time instructional faculty legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining with this institution? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ⟶ (A.) ____% (approximate) percent represented *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE)*
2. No

Please fill in your name and your title at this institution, as well as the names and titles of any other individuals who have answered one or more questions in this questionnaire, and the question numbers each individual worked on. Include telephone numbers in case we have any questions about any entries.

Your responses to these items, as with all other items in this questionnaire, are voluntary and strictly confidential. The information provided in this questionnaire will be used only in statistical summaries. Furthermore, all information that would permit identification of individuals, including names and telephone numbers, will be removed from survey files.

YOUR NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________
PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTION #s: ______________________

OTHER NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________
PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTION #s: ______________________

OTHER NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________
PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTION #s: ______________________

OTHER NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________
PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTION #s: ______________________

OTHER NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________
PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTION #s: ______________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED PREPAID ENVELOPE TO:

National Opinion Research Center (4552)
University of Chicago
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1996 – 420 - 986 / 60367

United States
Department of Education
Washington, DC 20208–5652

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, $300

Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Education
Permit No. G–17

Standard Mail (A)